THE ART OF LEADERSHIP

By

THE SAME AUTHOR

❂

INSTINCTS IN INDUSTRY
1918

THE PEOPLE'S PART IN PEACE
1918

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION
THIRD EDITION
With Henry C. Metcalf
1933

HUMAN NATURE AND
MANAGEMENT
SECOND EDITION
1933

LABOR RELATIONS UNDER THE
RECOVERY ACT
With Henry C. Metcalf
1933

CREATIVE MANAGEMENT
1935

THE ART OF LEADERSHIP
1935

THE CASE FOR DEMOCRACY
1938

THE ART OF

LEADERSHIP

BY

ORDWAY TEAD

Lecturer in Personnel Administration
Columbia University

XXI

To

THREE STUDENTS OF LEADERSHIP

who have encouraged my continuance of its study

WALTER VAN DYKE BINGHAM
HENRY CLAYTON METCALF
HARLOW STAFFORD PERSON

PREFACE

THE purpose of this book is to set forth the meaning and methods of leadership as contrasted with the concept and methods of command which have so long prevailed in organized human affairs.

My desire is to help those who direct others, or who will presently occupy positions of influence over others, to know why it is better to lead than to boss, and to understand how the art of leading can be in some measure acquired.

A second and complementary purpose is to provide organizations which recognize the importance of helping executives to become leaders, with a volume that supplies the essential subject matter for a study of this relatively unexplored art.

Fortunately, enough leadership training has already been successfully undertaken in business, in philanthropies, in the church and in education, to give some definite clues as to the necessary scope and content of such study, and to give the lie to the old saying that leaders are born and not made. Truly there are born leaders; but many of the rest of us possess qualities which can be developed with the result that our skill at leading may be appreciably strengthened.

Essentially, the art of leadership uses identical methods in many kinds of situations. Yet it is impossible in a volume of reasonable length to cite illustrations from every possible field where these methods may be applied. A constant application of the principles and methods here outlined should be made by the alert reader to his own situation and needs. For no matter

how concrete my suggestions, the necessity for relating
them to one's own organized group activities remains.

I have tried to write with my eye always on the
arena of affairs, and not on the library. And at every
point I have been thinking in terms of actual exper-
iences in business corporations, in institutional manage-
ment, in educational organizations, in governmental
departments and bureaus, in philanthropic and social
bodies, in adult education groups and in religious and
character-building institutions. I am convinced that
many psychological truths are equally applicable and
vital in all such organized relationships.

The reader should also remember that in discussing
a subject like leadership, which has numerous facets,
it is necessary to look at them one at a time. Yet the
total view of the whole is the only one which is fully
true. Some, for example, may think that at times I
pay too little attention to the leader, too much to the
followers. Others may think that I am trying to tell
leaders too much about gaining their own ends, irrespec-
tive of what the followers desire. I can only ask that the
reader hear me through and consider the view of leader-
ship here set forth in its entirety as a total going
activity.

Finally, I do not apologize for offering this study
without buttressing it at every turn by support from
controlled scientific experiments. I merely explain
that such experiments have thus far been lamentably
few; and if a book were to wait upon such formal
scientific corroboration, none would appear, perhaps,
for another decade. In such a field of observable human
behavior as that of personal leadership, we are not,
however, without data which offer evidence that may
fairly be said to allow a careful study to escape the
stigma of armchair theorizing.

Moreover, there are in the exercise of leadership
certain imponderables which will no doubt elude meas-
urement for some time to come. And the further my
study of this subject has progressed, the more I have
become impressed with the crucial importance of these
intangible psychic factors. Having started to write
a study of the "how," I have found myself more and
more required to stress also the "why."

Indeed, in a subject that necessarily has so much to
say about the relationships of people to each other, some
philosophical background is essential. And I would be
less than truthful if I did not urge my conviction that
these matters of basic outlook are as vital to mastery of
the art of leadership as any details of method.

Aside from specific acknowledgments in footnotes, I
am glad to take this occasion to thank a number of
friends who have read the manuscript for their numer-
ous helpful suggestions. And I would call special atten-
tion to the inspiration and suggestion received from
two sources. There is a wealth of material on this whole
subject in the symposium entitled "Business Leader-
ship" (1930) edited by Dr. Henry C. Metcalf. And
there is an abundance of shrewd, common-sense
experience in "Personal Leadership in Industry"
(1925) by David R. Craig and W. W. Charters.

ORDWAY TEAD.

NEW YORK,
    December, 1934.

P. S. In response to numerous requests from groups
which are using this book as a text for the conference
study of leadership, I have prepared "A Teaching and
Study Aid" containing questions and case problems for
each chapter. This is available in mimeographed form
(eighteen pages) at a nominal charge from the Associa-
tion Press, 347 Madison Avenue, New York City.

O. T.

March, 1, 1936.

CONTENTS

THE ART OF LEADERSHIP

CHAPTER I

THE DEMAND FOR LEADERS

ON EVERY hand today the cry is for more and better leaders.

But this recurring assertion suggests little as to why this demand has become so insistent. Nor does it help to explain just what it is that people expect of leaders. We face a general sense of a vital need. Yet it can hardly be satisfied until we consider why the need is so pressing and what the true meaning of leadership is.

If talent for leading can be developed at all, these preliminary questions have first to be cleared away. Examples of the kind of demand which is being voiced throw light upon the character of the problem. They show a shift in emphasis in the thought and conduct of organization heads. Thus they set the stage for the unfolding of a drama of absorbing human interest. For here is a drama which has for its theme the struggle between two ideas and sets of values; the idea of a beneficial art of leadership is struggling for ascendancy over the idea that command and the exercise of authority are more effective in the handling of organized human relations.

What varied expressions this increasingly felt need is producing is shown by reference to particular cases. Not long ago, for example, the president of a large corporation called to his New York office the superintendents of the company's ten manufacturing units. His remarks to them were as follows:

Gentlemen, we have always believed that our relations with our workers were built up with a consistent and liberal personnel policy. We pay wages and salaries above the market rates. We make systematic provisions for sickness, death and old age. Our various thrift plans have resulted in a relatively high percentage of home ownership among our staff. Our unemployment compensation plan, although it had to be modified as the depression went on, has meant and will mean again an assurance of stable income. Our employee representation plan was carefully devised and it has been in operation for ten years now—long enough for our men to have developed confidence in our willingness to deal with them in a straightforward way on any questions they may wish to raise. In several of our plants we have collective agreements with labor unions in certain crafts. And these dealings have worked out well.

Still I am not satisfied with the kind of response and cooperation we get. We need and have a right to expect a greater internal harmony and unity of drive among us all. We have to have this if our company is to succeed—not merely in making money but in building men as well.

You know that we have had various executive training activities from time to time. Now we need these more than ever from top to bottom among our supervisory staff. But we need a new emphasis. We must train for leadership and try to make our executives real leaders of people.

I believe our policies of industrial relations are developing soundly. But I don't believe they are interpreted adequately to get the cooperation they should. Executives who are leaders can and will get across that interpretation and help to create a better attitude in the rank and file. They can arouse enthusiasm and create improved morale.

We won't get these until we all try to lead—and not merely boss.

Also, if we do lead, we can be confident that whatever forms of organized relations our men want to have with us will contribute to and not tear down a spirit of cooperation. Real leadership will help to build up a sound sense of a concert of interests among us all that can keep us a unified producing group whatever happens. . . .

Another meeting of quite different character, but prompted by the same kind of difficulty, was held recently at the call of the newly appointed State Prison Commissioner in a western state. Those whom he had summoned to meet him were the wardens of the several state's prisons. What he said was this:

I have asked you to meet with me because the desire of the responsible state officials in appointing me has been to effect a gradual but fundamental change in prison policy.

As you know, our attention in the prisons of this state has largely centered on preventing the escape of our charges. As long as we held them securely during their allotted terms, we were supposed to have done well. What happened to the men themselves, when they were under our care and when they got out, was felt to be little concern of ours.

The times now make different demands upon us. Prisons are more and more expected to be agencies, not of vindictiveness, but of correction, reeducation and readjustment of men to conditions of normal living. The whole increase in the use of parole looks in this direction.

How can we try to realize this aim? Many changes are no doubt called for. But one which must come, whatever else happens, is a new attitude of mind on the part of all prison officials who deal with the prisoners. They have been gaolers, bullies, custodians of men whom they feared. They must become educators, leaders, correctors of sick minds and a constructive force to help men back into normal relations with their fellows.

I know this change is not the work of a day. But essentially what we want is that prison officers from wardens down to guards shall be leaders of men. Only as this kind of attitude can be instilled, can we change the atmosphere of our institutions and humanize their aim and methods. . . .

A year or so ago the director in charge of the supervisors of district nurses throughout a large eastern city came to the author and this was her story:

We have forty supervisors, each in charge of a district of our city, and under each supervisor between twenty and

thirty-five nurses are engaged in visiting the homes of those requiring nursing service.

These supervisors do a splendid job. But the depression has increased their problems in various ways. Promotions are slower; work is harder; incomes are reduced; fatigue is a factor.

We all believe that we could do a better job if for a time we stopped conferring quite so much about our routine problems and discussed together how we can be better leaders. We believe we could improve the whole situation if we knew better what is involved in leading the nurses whom we direct. We want help in that direction. . . .

* * * * * *

True incidents like these could be multiplied by the score. They reveal a need both where individuals are directing others to get work done and where they are trying by personal influence to alter human behavior— as in schools, churches, political bodies, and character-building agencies. The demand is that executives do more than command and boss, and that public and professional guides do more than exhort and manipulate others.

WHY THIS DEMAND?

It is hardly possible to exaggerate how much associated group action there has to be in the modern world. In at least three quarters of his waking hours every adult now lives and moves and has his being in a succession of group efforts. There are groups in which we work—corporations, institutions, governmental departments and bureaus; those in which we play—golf clubs, athletic and leisure-time associations of all sorts; those in which we do civic work—political parties, "service" clubs, tax-payers' associations; those in which we are educated; those in which we worship;

or those in which we fraternize for the sheer pleasure, of social intercourse.

It is hard for us to realize what a relatively new fact this is—one imposing new challenges as the size and number of modern organizations continue to grow. The vital problem is *how to make group activity a happy and satisfying experience for people.* On every side people are coming to recognize that one crucial factor in the solution of this problem is the quality of leadership displayed within the groups they join.

Why is this so?

The answer is to be found in facts like these: Organizations today are typically found to be growing by division, like certain lower forms of biological life. They also assume the effective participation of hundreds of individuals who are continually joining them with little prior knowledge of what the organizations are striving to do. They tend, moreover, toward a more and more complex functionalizing of individual duties. They tend, finally, toward the building up of a wide geographical hierarchy of administration.

So recently has this problem come upon us in every walk of life that it is easy to ignore its unwholesome and artificial consequences. The combination of these factors separates the individual member or worker more and more from a vivid personal connection with the organizations he joins. The tie becomes impersonal, cold and uninspiring. Instead of the warm feeling of group solidarity which people want, they find only a tepid and formal relation to a corporate person. Such impersonality and contractual formality are abhorrent to our human nature. All its natural impulses rebel against a way of life so far removed from the blood stream of friendliness and personal devotion.

Consider more specifically what happens. Typically in many organizations—non-commercial and commercial alike—work is divided departmentally. Each department, division and operating section has a directive head. The contact of workers with the organization as such comes through that head if it comes at all.

Yet each individual's efforts are expected to fall into place as a related part of a whole large plan of pooled collaboration. Here is a problem which never solves itself spontaneously. However eager a "joiner" a person may be, he only comes to a sense of genuine oneness with his several groups as he experiences some deliberate unifying summons and personal quickening.

Whether it is joining a new church, entering a school, being newly employed by a corporation or coming into a garden club, everyone has had the painful experience of feeling unacquainted and unrelated, of feeling that he "doesn't know what it's all about," of "not feeling wanted," of "not knowing where he fits into the picture."

It takes a special effort on the part of someone in the organization to overcome this feeling. That effort toward a unifying of the desires and efforts of its members is a distinctive task of the leader.

Again, the division of labor characteristic of many kinds of organizations is a fact that tends to separate and isolate individual members from the central purpose. People's outlooks take their color largely from the kind of experience they have. The worker in the production department sees his department as all-important; those who work at selling stress the sales end. In every organization the tendency is both for the departmental heads and for the rank and file of members to see the organization's problems in terms primarily

of their own functional effort. And as departments and functions become more elaborated and more cut up, this danger of a solely specialized interest increases correspondingly.

It is necessary only to set down some of the typical functional divisions now found in organizations to see the likelihood of members losing their concern for the success of the whole in favor of their concern about their part of it. There are, for example, the functions of administration, supervision, purchasing, engineering, research, planning, publicity, production, finance, sales and personnel.

Only competent leaders can correct the tendencies which functionalism and division of labor create. Only the leader can keep the group committed to that unity of aim which alone produces the best results.

Look, moreover, at the many organizations which branch out from small departments of a local unit, to a whole local unit, to a district office, to a state branch, to a national headquarters. We see, for example, big railroad systems, the Red Cross, a national political party, the Y.M.C.A., the General Motors Company, the Roman Catholic Church, the American Federation of Labor. In every such instance leadership at the top is not enough, any more than authority at the top is enough. Both have to be divided and stepped down until every last member is effectively tied into the whole operation. Army organization has long recognized this truth. The top sergeant is trained to feel that he as truly as the general must be a leader.

The concern already exhibited in industry about improving the competence of the foreman, in the department store about the buyer, in politics about each ward committee head, in organizations like the

Y.M.C.A. about each local secretary—all this represents a new acknowledgment of the possibilities of improved leadership. The need is for an intimate and heartening personal stimulation at each point of contact with the entire membership, clientele or personnel.

Obviously, the field for exercising leadership has been enormously increased by this multiplication of organizations, functions, departments and subordinate geographic units. Formerly it was thought that reliance upon supermen and born leaders was enough. Now the demand is for effective leaders in many fields on many fronts and at successive levels of authority. There are simply not enough born leaders to go around! To develop them has become imperative.

Because of our need our idea of leadership must change. The leader is no longer to be looked upon as a unique individual set apart from humanity by unusual personal qualities. The leader in one organization is often the follower in another. Most of us are normally followers in many activities. Some of us are leaders in one field only, while the more capable are found to be leaders in several fields simultaneously. Some are leaders temporarily—as when they are elevated by elections; others are leaders more permanently by appointment or by personal eminence. And occasionally one is in fact a leader although he carries no title and works wholly behind the scenes. Many so-called political bosses, for example, who have never held public office, exhibit qualities of genuine leadership and exercise great power.

In other words, faced as we are by a new kind of world—one in which organized action is the typical channel and area of personal effort—organizations require more than to be administered. They need to be led because the human relations of the leader to the

follower are far more normal and necessary to personal responsiveness than the orders of the commander or the routine contacts of the executive.

HOW DOES LEADING DIFFER FROM COMMANDING?

Popular notions of leadership tend to be expressed in terms of power to command or ability to dominate. The whole contention of this book is, however, that commanding of itself is wholly inadequate as a basis for getting results from people working in association. All our knowledge of human nature confirms this view.

Contrast, for example, two familiar attitudes. A civil engineer who does outdoor construction work said this: "We never bother about grievances or misunderstandings with our men. If they don't obey us as they should, we fire 'em on the spot and hire somebody else." That is command in its more naive manifestation.

The personnel vice-president of a large company, on the other hand, said this: "More and more we are trying to offer our workers a life career in our employ. In taking on a man we are trying to establish a relation which will be right and happy both for him and for us. And we take a lot of time both at the start and all the way along to build up that sense of a permanent common interest. We pay a lot of attention to having our foremen and department heads translate the company's good will to the workers and bring them into a feeling of being in and of the company." That is the temper and desire which characterizes real leadership.

Again and again executives both in business and in non-commercial organizations have stated that merely for people to know what they are supposed to do is not enough. A worth-while objective, a good organization plan, a disposition to act fairly *for* the members of a group—these alone never produce the strongest group

cooperation and morale. Someone must make it all *appealing*. Someone must make the group loyal to the purpose. Someone must be able to show people how they are benefited by joining. That someone is the leader.)

Command is interested in getting some associated action which the commander wants to secure. It is an exercise of power *over* people.

(Leadership is interested in how people can be brought to work together for a common end effectively and happily. It implies, as it has been said, the use and creation of power *with* people. The former is interested solely in the result. The latter is equally concerned about the process by which the result is attained.)

Those with the command attitude tend to assume that organizations as such can be self-propulsive—can be bossed into survival. The fact is quite otherwise, as the rise and fall of organizations prove. In any organization the really vital momentum is small and routine. As its size and age increase the danger grows that the big, animating purposes will be diluted, misconceived or even forgotten. Followers have constantly to be restored to warm and compelling contact with the central sources of power and motive. And these sources of power have to radiate out, be stepped down and transformed into local light and heat.)

\Commanders tend also to believe that organizations exist solely to fulfill the purpose they are specifically organized to carry out. Such a view is dangerous in its practical consequences. For it does not take adequate account of how people really do respond best even in groups where the main objective may be acceptable to them. A corporation which always acted literally on the premise that "we're not in business for our health; we're here to make money" would obviously

make many short-sighted decisions. A golf club that was run just to make it possible to play golf would lose its members. For they also want as accompanying values such things as care in the selection of members, a pleasantly appointed club house, a chance for their families to take lessons of the "pro" and an occasional evening social function. A church which did nothing but conduct worship would be regarded by many as too austere an organization to join.

In other words, in every organization, irrespective of its explicit aim, *the whole man has to be appealed to and ministered to*. It is a false over-simplification of human motives to assume that people in joining a group do so with only a fraction of themselves. In addition to satisfying that fraction, organizations must also have regard for the total sense of worthfulness and self-enhancement which individuals are always struggling to secure for themselves.

The commander, because he has the power, can easily put the welfare of the organization ahead of the welfare of its members. The leader because he knows human nature will strive to make the welfare of the organization and of its members one and the same thing. For he will appreciate that *organizations are always means to an end, agencies to help achieve what people want. It is the human beings themselves who are the ends.*

Commanders direct organizations, and in so doing subordinate individuals to organized ends. Leaders guide and develop individuals so that they may the better share in realizing group ends in the shaping of which they will also share.

It follows from this that the satisfaction of the leader is no justifiable end and aim. The leader may attain a sense of good work well done; he may achieve glory or even virtual sainthood in the memory of the race.

But he leads because he offers people something they want. They without him cannot be made perfect. He is a summoner to organized effort. He is the agent of a power that uses him. That power by whatever name it is called is a real human creation—a product of the psychological fact that in human affairs the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

In short, organizations, if they are not to rely solely on fear or intimidation to compel their members' efforts, have to operate through the power and desire generated in the members. They must have morale. For morale is that pervasive attitude of voluntary, enthusiastic and effective mobilization of a group's efforts for the accomplishment of some purpose. And that attitude is called out and sustained by a good leader. Without him it rarely appears.)

To achieve morale the desires and motives of followers have to be summoned, focused and released. Despite the fact that human institutions are often said to be the shadow of one man, they are in truth far more the shadow of the zeal of those who helped him. That zeal is not the result of commanding and directing. It is the product of a summons and a rallying of eager desire to do something believed to be important. It is that summons which the good leader brings.

ARE EXECUTIVE WORK AND LEADING THE SAME?

Obviously the activity of many leaders includes much of what is called executive work. But is it equally true that the work of all executives in so far as they deal with people also requires leading?

The answer to this question is to be found in a careful analysis of executive work. Typically it includes the following efforts: (1) planning and defining policies and procedures; (2) organizing the activities of others; (3)

delegating authority and responsibility; (4) controlling these in terms of the results desired; (5) supervising the general progress of results; (6) giving general orders or instructions; (7) interpreting and transmitting policies; (8) training key subordinates to carry the executive load; (9) coordinating all the various efforts and elements. Then, finally, there is the important task of *stimulating and vitalizing* all the individuals who are contributing their effort.

It is this last phase which has been least considered as a conscious, necessary duty by many executives. It is at this point that the leader asserts himself as more than an executive. For he realizes that stimulation and vitalizing are essential, and he goes about supplying this needed energizing in a psychologically sound way. He is able to take the usual occasions of executive contact and pour into them the catalyzing influence of positive desire and unity of aim. "He's a swell guy to work for" is the tribute the executive gets only when he rises to the level of the leader.

What he does is to combine human energies in a way that creates a new and satisfying harmony of effort. In that harmonizing there is also a literal creation of new power. Vital reserves are tapped. New levels of attainment are reached. Passive consent among the member-workers gives place to active assent. Apathy gives way to enthusiasm. Indifference becomes conviction. Inertia is translated into initiative. Of such is the nature of leadership.

It is like the turning on of the inexplicable current which brings into action the great complex of an electric engine. Individuals in a group are stirred by the prompting of deep self-propelling motives which add to the relationship a power, a tone and a tonic which have a literally electrifying effect.

EXECUTIVE POSTS ARE LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

The opportunity to be a president, manager, superintendent, executive secretary, department head, teacher, team captain, supervisor, foreman or gang boss is thus *an opportunity to be a leader.* Every directive post over people is potentially a leadership post.

Unless and until this is true, a working group is an accumulation of independent, individual efforts which are all but unrelated psychically—that is, all but unaware that they are in and of a group. Leadership galvanizes this unrelatedness into group unity, group pride and group collaboration.

The appalling fact is that many people are working in organizations where the dynamic of real leadership has never touched them. They work necessarily in association. But they fail to obtain any adequate and enhancing sense of *associatedness.*

That sense is not merely valuable for the group. It is an indispensable and basic demand made by each individual in it. For the sense of achievement and worthwhileness which each person yearns to have can be primarily secured in one of two ways—by solitary creativeness as in the case of the artist, or by social effectiveness as in the case of most of the rest of us. And today that social expression of personality comes about in group behavior and in group participations.

Thus the leader's problem is in large part to enable individuals to be themselves in and through their group efforts. This is not only possible; it is essential if the boundaries of personality are to be enlarged and if the scope of self-expressive behavior is to be as wide as the activities required of us.

But this sense of associatedness does not arise spontaneously. It arises as each member is mobilized and

led into such a sense. From the individual's point of view to be so led becomes a moral right. From the leader's point of view so to lead becomes a moral responsibility.

It is in this profound sense that it can be truthfully said that people hunger to be led. And it is the rightful effort to satisfy this hunger that puts upon each executive the added responsibility of leading.

In short, organizations need command and executive direction *plus* leadership. The leader is demanded as a releaser of the energies of his followers, as the summoner to attainment at levels they had not suspected they could reach.

It may be objected that this sets up too high a conception of the leader's function. In a business corporation, for example, is not the task of a department foreman in rallying workers to his leadership a relatively simple role? In a police precinct is not the leadership to be exercised by the police captain merely a question of getting his men to do their jobs well? In a professional baseball team, is not the manager a good leader when he produces a winning team and big gate receipts?

What have individual leaders in such situations as these to learn from the greater and more generally acknowledged leaders of mankind?

The answer is, of course, that there is a vast deal to be learned. The difference between the great leader and the leaders who occupy the thousands of relatively lesser posts throughout society is not one of kind, but only of degree. The executive leader and the teacher or other professional leader are successful as they take their cues from those whom time has shown to have been significant leaders.

If, in this book, too high a standard seems to have been set for the leader to follow, it should be remembered that the pattern has to be established. Such principles as are here suggested derive from the examples of those accounted successful as real leaders in the long view of history. How well each of us can translate all this into the terms useful for ourselves as leaders is another question.

The real problem is not how we can be leaders within present preconceptions of that role. It is rather: how can we all as leaders bring to the situations we confront as much as possible of the kind of power and glory that leadership at its best has always contributed? To meet the problem of being a worthy leader on any lesser terms than these is a belittling of ourselves, of our positions as leaders and of the idea of leadership itself.

Chapter II

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

ON MARCH 4, 1933, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt stepped to the microphone to deliver his inaugural address as President, he faced a country which was plunged into confusion and discouragement. As his voice rang out clear and confident, as he said that the thing to be most feared was fear itself, as he set forth the outlines of policy he proposed to follow, there came an almost instantaneous response of public support and of public trust. The sentiment and outlook of a whole people seemed to improve over night. They seemed to agree that here was a program that promised well for them. And they tackled the problem of consciously working themselves out of a depression with new courage and new faith in directed effort.

A *leader* was felt to be at the helm!

When, however, the President sat down at his desk at the Executive Mansion, when he presided over his first Cabinet meeting, and when his several Cabinet members took up the directive duties over their several departments, leadership was also being exercised—if of a less spectacular kind.

In line with what has been said in the first chapter, every executive—whether he deals with people directly as in the case of a factory superintendent or store manager, or deals with them indirectly as in the case of the president of a chain of retail stores—is potentially in a position where he should lead people. He has the

task of bringing them into an effective working harmony
with the purposes of the whole organization.

Again, the minister of a church, the president of a
college, the executive secretary of a so-called character-
building agency, the producing director of a play, a fire
department captain—to name only a few examples—
are also making the effort to lead a group of people to
accomplish something together.

What, then, is the common factor which runs through
these diverse activities? Is there an underlying identity
of intention and attitude which distinguishes all these
efforts from being only directive or executive or inspira-
tional? What, in short, is leadership?

The definition which is at once the premise upon
which this book is written and the result of the study
out of which it arises is this:

*Leadership is the activity of influencing people to
cooperate toward some goal which they come to find
desirable.*

Obviously there have been other conceptions in other
times, which gave the name of leader to those who could
dominate and command, to those in positions of head-
ship who bore titles of authority. The unique emphasis
in the idea of leading here advanced is upon *the satisfac-
tion and sense of self-fulfillment* secured by the followers
of the true leader. Today a psychologically and demo-
cratically adequate idea of leadership centers as much
attention upon the results *within the led* as on the
attributes or tangible methods of the leader.

To be fully understood, this definition has to be
enlarged and further illustrated in order that all of the
intended meaning may be read into it. There are at
least four separable factors to be taken account of.
First, it is useful to examine the way by which people
rise to leadership. Second, the process of influencing

requires study. Third, the nature of goals which people will find desirable has to be analyzed. And fourth, the qualities exhibited by leaders in action can be considered.

These several elements in the modern idea of leadership will be discussed in ensuing chapters.

But before doing this, it may be well to state that there are several kinds of leadership—in the sense that the word is popularly used. People speak of an author's or artist's leadership in his field, meaning his individual eminence. They speak of leadership in the scientific, philosophic or other intellectual realm in a similar way. And, finally, they speak of leadership as a more direct relationship of a man or a woman, either to large groups as in political affairs or to smaller units where the directive or inspirational effort is more immediate and face-to-face.

It is in this last sense that the activity of leading is here considered. It is the problem of the fruitful relation of those who direct to those who are directed and of those who are acknowledged guides of others in groups—such as teachers and club leaders of various kinds—to those who come under their influence.

HOW DO PEOPLE BECOME LEADERS?

THEODORE ROOSEVELT and Calvin Coolidge first became presidents of the United States because they were vice-presidents at a time when a President in office passed away. The initial opportunity to occupy this high post came about through forces quite outside themselves.

Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in an hour of the country's need when a strong affirmative attack upon the demoralizing inroads of the worst depression in American history was popularly demanded. An opportunity for constructive leadership was urgently presented. The times were with him.

The careers of Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler and Gandhi are all hard to dissociate from the circumstances of time and place in which they functioned.

These are, of course, instances of leaders of large affairs. But it can be shown to be generally true that every leader is as much a product of the setting of his life and times as of his own will to power. How great a leader one becomes may be greatly conditioned by personal factors. But the opportunity to lead is furnished by the total environment. It is always related to specific situations and needs. Only partially does the leader by virtue of innate powers wrest the right to lead from reluctant surroundings. The surroundings must be ripe for cohesive and energizing action.

This statement applies just as truly to the executive who is called upon to be also a leader, as it does to the

individual who is elevated to leadership in other ways. The executive gets his chance to lead because the situation in which he finds himself—of being responsible for the direction of others—is one where the best results come in terms of leading rather than in terms of commanding.

The first conclusion to be reached about the way in which people become leaders is therefore a realization that *the setting of the person's activity must be appropriate* to encourage leadership into existence. It is important to grasp the implication of this truth that it is the situation, and not the person alone, which allows the leader to function. For it emphasizes the point that the leader in one vital aspect of his role gets some of his power by virtue of a relationship. This is the impersonal phase. He is at once an instrument and a tool of circumstances outside himself. This makes him a servant of the led—a guide for them in helping to carry through certain purposes. He is not present by any divine right, nor is he born to certain unique prerogatives. Genuine insight on this point was shown by the French political leader who said when his followers seemed to be deserting, "I must follow them, since I am their chief." There are, of course, times when to voice such a sentiment might mean that the leader was betraying his own high aims. But it remains true that a certain dependence upon the led in the situation in which they find themselves, has to be an acknowledged part of the astuteness of the leader.

Even when he seems to originate a movement or an organization of any kind, the leader is able to carry on and lead only when a significant number of people become convinced that he has something of value to be done. And when he is elected or appointed president

HOW DO PEOPLE BECOME LEADERS?

THEODORE ROOSEVELT and Calvin Coolidge first became presidents of the United States because they were vice-presidents at a time when a President in office passed away. The initial opportunity to occupy this high post came about through forces quite outside themselves.

Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in an hour of the country's need when a strong affirmative attack upon the demoralizing inroads of the worst depression in American history was popularly demanded. An opportunity for constructive leadership was urgently presented. The times were with him.

The careers of Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler and Gandhi are all hard to dissociate from the circumstances of time and place in which they functioned.

These are, of course, instances of leaders of large affairs. But it can be shown to be generally true that every leader is as much a product of the setting of his life and times as of his own will to power. How great a leader one becomes may be greatly conditioned by personal factors. But the opportunity to lead is furnished by the total environment. It is always related to specific situations and needs. Only partially does the leader by virtue of innate powers wrest the right to lead from reluctant surroundings. The surroundings must be ripe for cohesive and energizing action.

This statement applies just as truly to the executive who is called upon to be also a leader, as it does to the

individual who is elevated to leadership in other ways. The executive gets his chance to lead because the situation in which he finds himself—of being responsible for the direction of others—is one where the best results come in terms of leading rather than in terms of commanding.

The first conclusion to be reached about the way in which people become leaders is therefore a realization that *the setting of the person's activity must be appropriate* to encourage leadership into existence. It is important to grasp the implication of this truth that it is the situation, and not the person alone, which allows the leader to function. For it emphasizes the point that the leader in one vital aspect of his role gets some of his power by virtue of a relationship. This is the impersonal phase. He is at once an instrument and a tool of circumstances outside himself. This makes him a servant of the led—a guide for them in helping to carry through certain purposes. He is not present by any divine right, nor is he born to certain unique prerogatives. Genuine insight on this point was shown by the French political leader who said when his followers seemed to be deserting, "I must follow them, since I am their chief." There are, of course, times when to voice such a sentiment might mean that the leader was betraying his own high aims. But it remains true that a certain dependence upon the led in the situation in which they find themselves, has to be an acknowledged part of the astuteness of the leader.

Even when he seems to originate a movement or an organization of any kind, the leader is able to carry on and lead only when a significant number of people become convinced that he has something of value to be done. And when he is elected or appointed president of a club, manager of a business or the head of an in-

stitution, his chance to lead grows out of some organized need for his influence. The power he is called upon to evidence is not his alone; it is his power to line others up with him to get a group project put through.

This is one of the chief reasons why any arrogance, pride of place or selfish grasping of power is so unwarranted and so unattractive. A true appreciation of the nature of leadership calls rather for an underlying humility of spirit such as the responsibility for the welfare of others always induces in persons of sensibility and discernment. This fact should prove a powerful antidote to personal vanity.

A related truth is that the measure of the leader's success lies outside of and beyond himself. It lies in effective results at the point where the followers act. His justification is his ability to forward an effective exercise of his followers' talents in accomplishing the purpose upon which they are agreed. Fruitful participation in the task by the rank and file in the front line, and results at the point where they are active—these are the acid test.

The department store manager demonstrates leadership when the sustained results of his work register in the increasing sales of the sales persons. The general is no more capable of victory than his first-line soldiers are able to effect a wise and brave execution of maneuvers. The trade association secretary is a strong leader only to the degree that he can get cooperative action on issues that contribute to the prosperity of his industry.

This is not the whole story of success in leading. The department store must supply its sales people with goods which will be in demand and support the selling act in numerous other ways. The army staff must provide coordinated aids to enable front-line bravery to yield more than foolhardy suicide. The trade asso-

ciation secretary must know what issues are crucial
and what measures are practical. The importance of
supplying proper instruments and of being persuasive
in getting them applied—these, too, are aspects to
be stressed.

The leader should always realize that he achieves
only as he is in a situation where those he leads can
achieve. If the situation and opportunity are thus so
important, it is necessary to be clear as to the manner
in which elevation to leadership actually takes place.
This elevation usually comes about in one of three ways.
Leaders push themselves up. They are selected by the
group. Or they are appointed by some top responsible
power.

THE SELF-CONSTITUTED LEADER

The leader who pushes his way up does so by the
combination of a strong personality with a vigorous,
assertive ego and a steady determination to accomplish
certain results he sees as important. Historically it
is this type which usually has been thought of as the
born leader. Yet such a one leads only when he is born
and arrives in a crucial hour of the world's need of him.
He does not function apart from the demands of a
confluence of circumstances outside himself.

Religious and social leaders of this heroic mold are to
be sharply distinguished from the Napoleons, the con-
querors, dictators and despots—the dominant egoists
who have shown many characteristics of leadership,
yet who push themselves into power usually by military
aggression and arbitrary seizure of political power.
It is useful to see where this latter egoistic type of
so-called born leader has failed—or at least where it has
disclosed its limitations.

For these leaders are the ones who impose themselves; their will to power is inordinate and insatiable. They thrive on the "passion for authority" and the "thirst for obedience" which are ever present in human nature. They are forces to reckon with, for people come to be convinced that in submission to them they are caught up into a larger whole and come to desire, somewhat hypnotically, despairingly or mistakenly, what the leader desires. There are no doubt times and places where *temporarily* such dominant figures provide a unity of purpose and clarity of intention for which people are passionately yearning. Especially in troubled times of political and economic uncertainty do such figures have their fruitful if transitory successes. Their meteoric careers are momentarily plausible, and many who are persuaded that here is a good cause to be served realize too late that they have followed not a leader but a master.

Leaders of this self-made type are by no means unfamiliar in the business world. Occasionally in corporations or institutions one finds the "benevolent despot"—the paternalistic manager who gains considerable personal loyalty just so long as he is allowed to decide what is good for people and to provide it for them in his own way. Such well-intentioned but autocratic pseudo-leaders are to be identified by such phrases as the following: "We've never had a strike in our plant because my men trust me and know I give them a square deal." "Company unions may be a good thing in some places. We do not need them here." "The workers know our problems because I tell them what they are." "I tell my men my door is always open if they have any troubles." "We believe that by offering better terms and conditions of employment than our competitors our men will stay loyal."

It is true that there is a nice distinction to be observed between doing things for people so they will stay subservient and doing things with them so that they will learn how to do them for themselves. Paternalism in a polyglot and pioneering setting may yield real benefits. It is not necessary, therefore, wholly to disparage the self-willed and individualistic leader. But it is necessary to understand his limitations as the setting changes. In its pure form this kind of leadership becomes more and more of an anachronism—more and more inept as people "feel their oats," want to have a sense of independence and self-respect, and "want to call their souls their own." It is a form of leadership uncongenial to the whole mood of a democratic society.

He was an honest chairman of the board of directors who told a friend of mine who, as president of a corporation had instituted twenty years ago an employee representation plan, "You go ahead and deal with the men that way. It may be all right but I was brought up in the old school and I don't want to have anything to do with these new-fangled schemes. This isn't my game. I might get mad and tell 'em to get the hell out of here."

The basic limitation of all such careers all through history has been that their appeal has not been made *high enough* to gain permanent support. In military campaigns, in intense nationalistic appeals and in benevolent business employments, the cause of the ruthless or highly autocratic leader can be made plausible to the followers and can yield sacrificial loyalty—often for a long time. But sooner or later the question begins to 'go the rounds: "Are we really getting from this hero the enhancement, the security, the power in and for ourselves which we had expected?

Does this identification truly identify us with what we find most worthy in living?"

The fact is that this kind of rule of one, *because that rule ministers to the ego of the ruler*, sooner or later gives to followers a progressively unsatisfactory answer to their questions. To reconcile the feeding of that ego— with all the dangers of its growing in pathological directions and proportions—with the feeding of the self-esteem, to say nothing of the mouths of the followers, *has always proved difficult, if not impossible, over a long period.*

Not all strong and compelling personalities, of course, are projected into the large world of national arenas. On lesser levels this type will get itself elected or appointed, whether democratically out of the group or from the controlling nucleus of a group which wants to delegate headship. Hence a good reason for characterizing such leaders is to issue a warning that the strong egoist has the weaknesses of his strength, if one is thinking in terms of the conception of leadership here advocated.

In other words, the excessively aggressive person of resolute purpose is always in danger of forgetting the desires of his followers because he is under the spell of his own adroitness and power to influence them for ends which are always more his than theirs. There can be such a thing as too commanding and impressive a presence, too dominant an ego, too ruthless a desire to realize one's own intention by using whatever means and instruments are at hand. And all this will not be leadership in any sense that goes to the root of the problem practically or spiritually.

THE GROUP-SELECTED LEADER

The second process, that of selecting the head man from the group and of building up his status and

influence into leadership proportions, is typical in democratic political societies. It takes place also in fraternal bodies, trade associations, professional associations and in certain religious groups not dominated by an established hierarchy.

This process has the merit of predisposing those who are led to follow because they believe they can trust the purposes of the leader. Those purposes have originally come from group beginnings. What is first wanted is an agent to supervise the execution. Later he may be able to persuade others to enlarge or alter their aims. But such a leader starts as the elected president, chairman, executive director or political official, with the comforting sense among his followers that he is "one of the gang" and a "regular fellow."

This is a tremendous help. The challenge to the leader here is one of sustaining and deepening the support and cooperative intention—not of creating it from nothing. In such situations there is already a reasonable agreement between the leader and the led as to what they want. The followers do not have to be converted to the objective, and that is an immeasurable gain and source of strength for the leader. His major problem here is rather how the aim is to be achieved. He earns his right to lead in any continuing sense by supplying this "how."

It is perhaps this fact as much as any other which gives rise to the need for analyzing and inculcating the detailed techniques of the leader in action. For once objectives are agreed upon, the leader's success depends upon the practice of an art of human relations about which much is known. And that leader will be most successful in retaining his right to lead who can help a group to get what it wants with the least friction and the most sense of unity and self-realization.

In one way, therefore, this second type of leader, the group-chosen one, has the most auspicious conditions for success. Yet in another way he is in comparatively greater difficulty because he is *always* being tested, always being weighed in the balance. For as long as the possibility of re-election or reappointment is present, the right to lead has to be continuously earned.

There is, however, a significant exception to this statement that the group-selected leader may have the best chance of winning and holding his following. There has been a considerable body of experience in "producers' cooperatives" with the selection of foremen by the men in their departments. This is in line with the theory of this type of organization as a pure cooperative democracy of workers banded together for producing purposes, utilizing capital resources which they themselves assembled. Here a directorate elected from the membership exercises general control, but each department preserves a certain autonomy. As might be guessed by anyone familiar with conditions which make administrative science a success in action, the consensus of this experience has not on the whole been favorable to securing the requisite shop discipline and to maintaining necessary standards of efficiency in production. It is necessary, therefore, to qualify the above conclusions as follows: Where constant application of individual effort in a sub-group is required, yet where there also exists complete agreement throughout the whole group as to the purpose to be served, the leader of the sub-group should be selected by the executive body of the whole group subject only to veto by the sub-group.

Essentially such departmental leaders even when appointed from the top control group, would in such a completely cooperative body as that described above,

be *indirectly* self-chosen by the sub-group. But the inevitable demand in economic organizations where work *is* work, is that the leader shall be administratively responsible to his followers only in the last analysis and not in the hour by hour contacts of his executive function.

THE LEADER APPOINTED FROM ABOVE

The third way in which people get the chance to be leaders is the method commonly found in many kinds of organizations—business, institutional, philanthropic and others—where boards of directors or trustees appoint head executives who in turn select the lesser executives. All such managerial persons are accountable for results obtained by others working under them. And these others may have been hired into employment without any necessary interest in the basic purpose of the organization.

Leaders of this kind are responsible for making followers out of hirelings. Their problem is to deal with those whose legal relation to the whole group is one of master and servant, in such a way that the legal relationship is transcended into something approximating a partnership. From a group somewhat casually brought together the executive leader has the truly difficult task of trying to galvanize into being some unity of interest, some morale which implies willing service in a common cause.

Here the group has not chosen the leader. The leader has assembled the group. In the first instance all they know is that they have been lucky enough to be hired, and that having a job is the condition of having the wherewithal to pay for food and shelter.

The leader's problem is to show them that in serving the corporate group they are serving themselves;

that in being loyal to the organization as a whole they are also loyal to themselves; that their personal sense of what is valuable in living will be realized in the efforts they may make on behalf of the prosperity of the group. His problem is to make them desire what the organization desires.

This may seem at first thought to be an easy problem to solve. But its true difficulty *in organizations where the workers have only a wage or salary relation to the corporate body* begins to appear when one examines the objectives of the organization and considers honestly just how the workers are in fact related to them in terms of a share in *control* and a share in the *results*— whether those results be satisfactions of service or tangible rewards of money.

In short, the difficulty of exercising leadership in business and institutional relations is not to be ignored, if the opportunity to lead in any profound sense is really being sought. Integral to an understanding of this difficulty is a grasp of the part his objectives play in determining how far the leader can go—how deeply he can appeal to his followers. This is the problem which Chapter V considers.

The next question relates to the ways in which personal influence is exercised. Much study has been devoted to this topic, and the application of the resulting findings to the uses of the leader will now be set forth.

HOW DO LEADERS INFLUENCE OTHERS?

"I LOVE power, yes, I love it!" said Napoleon, "but after the manner of an artist: as a fiddler loves his fiddle in order to conjure from it tone, chords, harmonies."[1]

The suggestion of the leader's artistry which this comment emphasizes is truer than is usually realized. The leader is an artist—an artist working in a medium which is at once complex and universal. His material is people. And just as the task of the artist is one of organization of ideas or materials if any work of art is to be achieved, so with leadership the bringing of human desire and energy into organized relations becomes a work of high artistry.

Indeed, this is more than a verbal analogy. The technical deftness, the new insight, the devotion to a vision, the effort at communication—these are all attributes of the artist which the leader should have. His task of influencing others—looking at the problem first from his point of view—should be gone at with artistic economy, precision and skill.

Knowledge of the processes of influencing people has greatly increased in recent years. The use of that knowledge by the leader is only a special case of applying truths which are in one form or other an everyday occurrence. For that reason it is here only necessary to state in a summary way what these several processes are and what may be their relative values to leaders.

---

[1] All footnote references will be found on pages 301-308.

The most important of these are: (1) suggestion; (2) imitation; (3) exhortation; (4) persuasive argument; (5) publicity; (6) reliance upon the logic of events; (7) a show of affectionate devotion; (8) the creating of a typical problem situation, the pressure of meeting which teaches its own lessons.

It is doubtful if any valid generalizations can be made in advance as to when the leader should wisely use one method or another. Often several influences are in operation at the same time. But a conscious knowledge about how each influence works is an important weapon in the armory of the leader.

Suggestion may be either direct or indirect. It is usually a verbal hint, often used to build up or maintain the prestige of the leader, or to avoid the danger of offending the pride or disturbing the self-confidence of the followers.

There are many situations in which the led will be favorably affected, for example, if the prestige of the leader is enhanced by the suggestion that there are other prominent supporters. The use of "names" on boards of directors, of "patrons" of philanthropic or artistic enterprises, of prominent backers of civic or political movements—this is a typical device for reinforcing leadership with the subtle suggestion of importance, respectability or social, intellectual or financial support.

Whatever is done, sometimes wisely and sometimes too formally, to set the leader apart is designed to the same end of suggesting importance and special status. Titles, uniforms, impressive quarters or offices, inaccessibility, dramatic public appearances—these are used. Conversely the leader's emphasis upon simplicity—once his status as leader is firmly established—may become most influential as suggesting to the led that the leader

is also a "regular fellow," that "he doesn't put on any dog," that " he seems just like one of us."

The story is told of a great President who went to review his army and inspect its encampment on the anniversary of a victory. The army officials had prepared an elaborate banquet as the crowning conclusion of his visit. Their plans were spoiled because the President insisted on sitting down at one of the bare wooden mess tables of the privates and sharing their simple evening meal—to the immense satisfaction of the common soldiers. President Franklin D. Roosevelt has in similar fashion eaten with the rookies at the Civilian Conservation Camps.

Suggestion is also of value where the followers may resent a direct plea and where there is time to let the power of suggestion work its way to effect desired changes. Many leaders have on occasion to be reminded of this time factor as one to work with and not against. There is frequently the temptation for the one who is superior to those he leads in quickness of intellectual grasp, capacity for execution or vision of desirable next steps, to rush ahead, momentarily forgetful of the followers' slowness. Here suggestion and a waiting for the "psychological moment" for the suggestion to bear fruit are highly important.

In politics a definite technique of "sending up a trial balloon" is often used to gauge in advance what the public response to some contemplated new policy may be. It is sometimes suggested in the press that it is learned "from sources believed to be close to the administration" that a certain project or policy is to be promoted. If the public reaction is adverse, the administration has been committed to nothing—can, indeed, repudiate the rumor. But enough has been suggested to sense the followers' attitude.

Suggestion is also useful in winning the adherence of key supporters who will convert others. The process by which new ideas are made to percolate down through a group is often one of suggestion. "If Bill Smith is for him, that's all I want to know. That's good enough for me. I'll join," or "I'll vote for him. . . . "

Of course there are all sorts of mechanical or material aids to repeated suggestion which are available as parts of publicity technique. Indeed, it sometimes seems that sufficient reiteration of a suggestion is one of the readiest means by which people's minds are changed.

Repetition of suggestions is not urged, however, as a method of securing *rational* acceptance of a leader's cause. One has to admit as a practical matter that there is much reasonably successful leadership where reasoned considerations are not the controlling factors. This is, of course, too important a point to leave with this observation. Fundamentally, in the long run the best leader is the one who is supported by the feeling among the led that the objectives being served are for them rational and reasonable. But it would be inaccurate not to recognize that in all human group effort the non-rational factors of influence are exceedingly powerful and humanly worthy. Among these the power of suggestion—the suggestion of prestige, of favorable environment, of helpful emotional appeals, of symbols, of slogans—occupies a prominent place.

Imitation is, of course, not an active process for the leader. It is rather a support upon which he can frequently rely once his person or his cause has become sufficiently established so that it becomes good form to join him and his group. Nothing succeeds like success, because people will inevitably imitate, copy and trail along as soon as success, status and esteem are present.

But imitation can be a dangerous form of influence to count upon. People may accept the symbol with no appreciation of the reality behind it. They pick up and repeat endlessly the slogans and battle cries of the leader; but by the time they have given them their own little interpretation or application, the truth behind the slogan may have shrunk to proportions which the leader would scarcely recognize.

The inevitability of imitation does unquestionably help to heighten the sense of group solidarity. There may be imitation of the leader's phrases, clothing, mannerisms, inflections. These all become identifying factors within the group, giving a sense of familiarity and unity. Such subtle aids are not to be slightingly viewed. But he would be a small-minded leader who placed too strong a reliance upon the forces of imitation to help him in achieving group cohesion.

Exhortation, preaching, oratory, lecturing—the direct appeal of the person through public discourse—this is a familiar fact in religion, education and politics. How valuable a means it is for permanently influencing others it is impossible to say. Certainly the retention of this method through the centuries would seem to offer some evidence of its value. In general its best use seems to have been to help impart a diffused glow of emotional fervor and enthusiasm. As a means of imparting information or reasoned argument it is by common consent cumbersome, slow and inefficient in contrast to other methods made possible by the printing press.

Its usefulness is limited by the failure of the emotional appeal to sustain enthusiasm, conviction and resolution over long periods. Human emotions are by definition not capable of prolonged expression without repetition of the stimulus which arouses them. Results in terms

of a permanent will to action are likely to be uncertain. There must always be more exhortation, more appearances of the leader before the led, more appeals to carry on. And all of this has to be supported by some intellectual content which will have a plausible ring, and by concrete ideas which will appeal to the followers. These need not be of a very high order. The elements of familiarity of phrase and idiom, of personal earnestness, of vocal resonance,—these are what gives exhortation its effect. Political and religious oratory are proverbial for their mouth-filling and empty clichés, their ardor and lilt. It is the exceptional leader who effectively transcends this level in his public appearances. Both the strength and the weakness of exhortation thus become obvious.

However, there are occasions where the personal public appearance of the leader has definite cohesive value, for which there is no substitute. His face-to-face presence has of itself emotional and compulsive value which cannot be ignored. The efforts of a presidential candidate to be seen by as many voters as possible in different sections of the country are in sound recognition of this value. And up to a point, the content of his utterance is of less importance than the sincerity, friendliness and general human amiability of his personality in action.

Public exhortation is a technique to be sparingly and discreetly used. It is relatively a slender reed for the leader to lean upon for sustained support. Its occasional place in arousing that emotional fervor which must attend the pursuit of many purposes cannot be ignored. But there has to accompany it some communication regarding the methods and details of procedure if anything but momentary excitement is to result.

In relation to leadership in the field of ideas, policies and methods, where the need is to influence individual minds to agreement on specific issues, *persuasion by argument* is not only necessary but of utmost importance. Reasoned consideration of issues, the weighing of all the evidence, the exploring of all possible alternate possibilities and the disposition to abide by the outcome of careful, pooled deliberation—these are indispensable steps in meetings of boards of directors and executive committees of all kinds of organizations.

An interesting instance of how persuasion was skillfully used was recounted by a safety engineer in the following report:

> Sometime ago it came to my attention that our medical examination was not strict enough to keep out new employees who could not measure up to a reasonable physical standard —especially in relation to the work of certain departments where the duties were heavy. And as this matter is governed by a Board of Managers of the Employees' Benefit Association, the proposal had to be taken up through it. When I approached this Board with the subject, I was confronted with considerable opposition, the Board being almost entirely composed of department heads of office workers, or departments where they had no experience of physical hazards.
>
> The chief argument presented against my proposal was that in the experience of the members no stricter standards were necessary. I immediately realized that the odds were against me, and it would require some quick action on my part to save the proposition from defeat.
>
> I began by putting the following questions to them: How much study have you given the matter? Do you keep records to show how many employees have been turned down as being physically unfit, and if so, how many? Do you keep a record showing what kind of illness each patient is suffering from so that you will know what sickness has cost each of the various departments from year to year? Do you know how many employees in the various departments are suffer-

ing with eye trouble at the present time? Can you truthfully
state that no employee has lost time from work since he was
hired due to the trouble that is now causing him to lose time?
If you have an employee in the department who has an ail-
ment that causes him to lose time occasionally, what effect
does it have on the remainder of the employees? Do you
know that the employees of one of the most hazardous
departments in the organization are costing less per capita
than other departments because they are watched over more
carefully, and if trouble arises, they are required to see a
doctor? That their physical stature is also taken into con-
sideration before they are hired by the department head?

I talked briefly on each of these questions and when I
finished, a member of the Board who is also an official of the
company took the floor and stated that he was convinced the
subject should be given further consideration. And as it
seemed that the two Safety Engineers had given considerable
study to the matter, he would suggest that two members of
the Board be appointed to work with the two Safety Engin-
eers and bring in their recommendations when they com-
pleted their report. In six weeks' time, we had the new form
of examination ready for adoption. And it was passed
unanimously by the Board with the promise that it would
cooperate in helping to work out a periodical physical
examination at any time the movement was started.

First—I found out what the objections were.

Second—I had sufficient data to show where the objections
were wrong.

Third—I cooperated with the Board in making the
change.

To know how to marshal evidence and opinion and
how to recommend desired courses of action persua-
sively is certainly an art which leaders should know how
to use. This whole aspect of the quality and keenness
of the leader's mental processes will be more fully dealt
with later. The conclusion seems inevitable that the
good leader is tremendously aided by being a clear
reasoner and friendly persuader.

Publicity as a method of influencing people is not, of course, a separate process, but a technique for supporting some of the other processes here under review. Its value today to build prestige, to multiply the power of exhortation, to interpret facts, attitudes and conclusions to all concerned, is so potentially great that stress should be placed upon it. In the widest variety of organized efforts at leading, attention to sound publicity is essential to success. And this is as true if ten are being led as if there are ten thousand. It is not without significance that in some corporations (erroneously in my own view) the public relations manager and the personnel manager are one and the same person, on the theory that many publicizing efforts among employees require methods similar to those with customers or the general public. This does at least indicate a new feeling that in large organizations publicity methods may be valuable in certain kinds of communication with all the members of the working group.

The choice of the mediums and methods of publicity depends obviously upon the size and character of the group of followers to be reached.[2] It is necessary, however, for the leader to observe the real distinction between publicity and propaganda. The one may perhaps be distinguished from the other by the disinterestedness of its appeal. Where the effort to influence others by the use of public channels of contact, such as newspapers, radio or motion pictures, is under cover, where the seeming intent is different from the real intent, where facts are partially given or wrongly interpreted to make a case, where the purpose to be served is selfish and narrow—in such instances it is more accurate to admit that it is propaganda and not

publicity which is being achieved. And as such it is a two-edged weapon.

Publicity is a more explicit, more forthright effort to utilize legitimate channels of communication to impart ideas and points of view as honest parts of an honest effort to inform followers or those desired as followers. In those terms it is a technique which can be utilized in many ways which are effective and well-known.

There come times in every organization when the leader finds he has to wait upon the *logic of events* to have his followers become aware of a problem or become interested in a proposed solution. However much the leader may be able to anticipate difficulties imaginatively, it is often impossible to make more than a few alert followers also look ahead. People worry about problems only when they can no longer be ignored. We do not naturally look ahead to borrow trouble. The old saw that you should "never trouble trouble till trouble troubles you" gives expression to a deep human trait.

Yet the true leader is wise for he is not typical in this respect. He sees the handwriting on the wall. He senses trends and tendencies at work in his surroundings. He has frequently to decide whether he will force the attention of his followers to imminent issues which may be controlled and reshaped by action, or whether he will let the march of events bring awareness of troubles to his followers in its own good time.

No major political leader, for example, since 1919, has apparently felt it to be good strategy to ask his constituency to face frankly the question of the cancellation of the war debts of Europe to America. Several Presidents of the United States who have had to confront this problem seem to have decided to procrastinate in handling it because no other manner of convincing

their supporters than the logic of events seemed likely to be effective.

A prominent industrial executive recently remarked, in a private discussion of company unions under the NRA, that in 1915 he had gone to the president of the large corporation in which he was serving as vice-president and urged the importance of instituting an employee representation plan along lines that were even then becoming familiar in a number of other large companies. The president's reply was that "we don't need that sort of thing in our company." It was not until the Recovery Act was passed that this company hastened to elect a new vice-president from outside its executive ranks—one whom the officers believed had the background and experience which would enable him to supervise the immediate introduction of company unions.

In the fullness of time events had finally impressed upon a group of executive leaders the desirability of a course of action formerly thought by them to be unnecessary.

Issues do arise, in short, in which watchful waiting has to be the leader's role. On these occasions he has also, of course, to know when the moment for definitive and affirmative leadership has arrived.

The *affectionate devotion* of the leader to the led is always a powerful dynamic force. As we shall see more fully later, a display of affection in its deepest meaning brings a strong response of personal devotion. "I would do anything for him"—is the attitude induced where the leader has impressed his followers with the strength of his loyalty to them. Without question some of the strongest instances of successful leading center around this influence. How the leader can be the kind of person who evokes this degree of devotion is one of the key

questions the student 'of leadership should ask. So important is it that a fuller answer is deferred until Chapter VI.

Consideration of what is perhaps the most efficient method of influencing others in groups has been left to the last.This is the method of *helping to create in and around the group of followers a definite set of conditions and circumstances which the followers feel as a problem or difficulty.* Its use could be rendered more effective in many cases by being more deliberate. Here the leader's effort is to have the difficulties themselves prod the followers to explore and adopt a new line of action which will lead to a change of sentiment and purpose in the direction the leader wants to go.

This is the process of deliberately allowing people to be plunged into trouble and allowing the experience to teach the lesson logically involved. On occasion this experience may be, as it is said, a "dear teacher." Admittedly the leader has to weigh the cost of it. But there are many situations in which people apparently will learn by no other method.

A good example comes from a mid-western city of fifty thousand people which has a fine hospital always supported before the depression by private donations and fees from those who could afford to pay. Doctor A, who is president of the state medical association and an active leader on the board of trustees of the hospital, has for some years held advanced views on ways and means of making medical service more generally available throughout the community on some basis of more moderate charges, more assured income to doctors and 'better quality of medical attention for everybody. "Socialized medicine" or "state medicine" is, however, still a bogey to many physicians and others in this community. Any proposals of improvements

which are to be acceptable must avoid any association
with the prejudices and unpopularity aroused by these
terms.

When, early in 1932, the income of the hospital began
to shrink toward the vanishing point, Doctor A saw
his opportunity both of capitalizing upon the logic of
events and of accelerating them in a problem direction.
Out of the difficulty felt by the trustees and the com-
munity, he hoped that some new community objective
and method of mutualized medical service might
result.

He discouraged the conducting of a new drive for
funds because of hard times. He pointed out the
need for reducing hospital fees in a depression. He
showed the great increase of free service which was
necessarily being given. He made it clear that the
closing of the hospital seemed definitely to impend.
This alternative was one, of course, which no one
cared to contemplate—least of all his medical colleagues.
Here was a major community problem.

He then proposed to the trustees, to the doctors and
to influential citizens a plan of cooperative hospital
support by moderate annual fees per family per year
by which, with the enrollment of several thousand
families, medical service for all the usual afflictions
and hospital service where needed would be guaranteed
to these families, and a guaranteed annual income
could be paid to the doctors.

He was instrumental in having made simultaneously
a community canvass which indicated that the requisite
number of families would join.

At that stage (the middle of 1932) his proposals
were far from having the enthusiastic support of his
fellow-doctors or of all the members of the hospital
board. But after pointing out to them in individual

conversations the quandary they were in and making them realize that the trial of his plan for a year could do no great harm and might do good, he was able to persuade a majority to give it a try. He then directed a publicity campaign which launched the venture decisively on its way.

Today the hospital is still open, the physicians are receiving an assured income, the families which have joined at a flat annual fee are anxious to continue the plan into another year, and free service is given the destitute. Sufficient enthusiastic support has been generated to entitle the plan to be called a success and to assure its continuance.

The elements in this situation are typical of numerous group experiences. A leader recognizes a difficulty; he helps to give it even sharper focus by allowing its impact to distress individuals the more acutely. He then offers a solution. Its acceptance may momentarily take place in a mood of despair or at least of lack of conviction as to its merits. But somehow the group is persuaded to make the trial. Confidence in the leader is of great help at this point. In the course of trying out his plan, people find that their own interests are well served and even better served than formerly. They find the solution practical, happy, sensible. Indifference changes to an active sentiment of support and cooperation. A real change of purpose has been affected; a real learning experience has been gone through. A leader has led.

Another instance comes to mind of a factory in which the owner had a passionate conviction of the desirability of fostering "democracy" among his people. One application of his principle which he believed it wise to make was to give workers in each department the right to elect their own foreman, subject only to veto by

himself as an extreme measure. On one occasion when such a selection had to be made he was convinced that the workers of the department in question had elected the wrong man. He decided, however, not to invoke his veto power, but to wait and see what happened. Two months later the men in the department came to him, stated they had made a mistake and asked that another election be held. To this, of course, he readily agreed, but he did so on condition that the men would handle the demotion of the present head and be sure that in returning him to his old position no ill-will toward the company would result.

This experience is cited, not to justify the owner's methods, but merely to illustrate how they taught those involved in the situation.

<center>THE LEADER AS SYMBOL</center>

A further fact not to be ignored is that people are influenced by a leader because he becomes the personal embodiment or symbol of the cause he is serving. Of outstanding value as helping to create a strong and deep attraction to many objectives is the loyalty which fastens upon the leader himself as an appealing and popular figure. People crave the flesh and blood reality of one who will say: "Come and follow me" or "Go thou and do likewise."

The potency of this appeal of the person is obvious in the great religions of the world, not only in relation to their founders but in the influence exerted by lesser leaders—saints, popes, bishops, priests and preachers. The person has become the symbol of the cause and has given prestige to it and human warmth. Indeed it is in religious groups that this loyalty has on occasion risen to its sublimest heights and to the most self-effacing, sacrificial devotion on the part of the followers.

And always, be it observed, this loyalty at its best has been based on the profound claim that he who would thus lose his life in devotion shall find it in self-discovery. The seeming complete renunciation demanded was always in favor of a larger self-realization to be made in part through identification with the person of the leader. The idea voiced in the sentence, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me," is a penetrating recognition of the truth of complete self-realization through complete loyalty.

A similar truth is to be observed in military affairs. Great generals—supported by colonels, majors, captains, lieutenants and sergeants—have symbolized a great purpose and often won a devotion which readily led to death itself.

In politics devotion is also to persons as more or less embodying an explicit purpose. A hierarchy of personal symbols and agents of the popular will is seen in presidents or premiers, governors, mayors and ward bosses.

It is only as one comes to examine the numerous secular organizations of today that there is found an astonishing disregard of the need for the leader as the personal symbol of purposes. And it is, of course, in these many groups that personal leadership has never gained the persuasive power which is potentially its due. Secular groups have a vital lesson to learn here from other realms of human activity.

The reasons for the leader as symbol are illuminating. Causes, movements and organizations struggle for purposes and aims which are often not directly related to the day-to-day concerns of the individual. The range of the necessary hourly preoccupations of most people is restricted. "Good government," "a world safe for democracy," "industry for service," "the

dictatorship of the proletariat"—these and any one of countless objectives do not *of themselves* clamor for the full devotion of most of us. Our inertia and the momentum of routines are too powerful. But let an Al Smith, a Woodrow Wilson, a Lenin, or a Gandhi project his personality into the cause, and his pictures soon appear in rotogravures and are framed in barber shops and homes. What these leaders wear and what they have for breakfast become items of absorbing interest—and what they strive to accomplish is then supported by thousands prepared to follow the lead even though they often have only a hazy grasp of the purpose to be served.

Who natively yearns to sweat and struggle to turn out as many tons of steel as possible in eight hours? Yet let a Charlie Schwab walk through the plant and chalk up in a prominent place the number of "heats" turned out by one shift, and those on the next shift may be moved to unprecedented exertion to better that figure.

A drive for funds for a community chest or for a college endowment does not spontaneously cause many people to buttonhole wealthy friends and stand at indifferent doorsteps to beg money. But let a popular mayor or a beloved college president spur the efforts of the money-raising "teams" and quotas are met and bettered.

People's capacity for dramatizing complex aims and for sustaining enthusiasm for relatively remote ends is conspicuously limited. At the same time, people's capacity for interest in and devotion to a *person* has always proved to be phenomenal. Next to interest in ourselves, our interest in other people is perennial. And when someone gathers prestige and articulates ideas, programs and aspirations which appeal to people,

the response to that person is assured. They throw up their hats and shout, "We're with you!"

This sense of being with the leader is a profoundly satisfying experience. The ego of individuals seeks release from narrow confines, seeks projection and expansion. Most people, perhaps, never get away from the yearning for someone who will play the father role for them—who will, also, play the hero.

The leader may in his personal appeal bring a comforting unity of desire out of the conflicting desires of the individual followers. He may help people to achieve enlargement of self through group membership, and a sense of oneness with him together with other persons. He may bring a sense of excitement, exhilaration and adventure in living which without him it seemed impossible to attain. Certainly these are psychological yearnings which we know exist, and the indifference to them of a sophisticated or ultra-rational few in the community cannot gainsay the potency of these human cravings.

We know that people have their popular heroes— not to be confused with leaders—and undoubtedly they serve some useful purpose of psychological release and expansion. Is it fantastic to suggest that the time may come when people will be anxious to frame for their parlors a photograph of their "boss" or of their local mayor, for example, along with a portrait of Lindbergh or Babe Ruth?

If this suggestion is greeted with a smile, it is only because our idea of leadership has not yet been domesticated. We fail to see its possible application to situations close to the vital interests of everyday living.

Loyalty to the leader as a personal symbol has, of course, its great dangers. Loyalty to the person may come to eclipse or even exclude loyalty to the cause.

The scheme of organization in many Protestant churches, unlike that of the Roman Catholic Church, shows, for example, repeated instances of parishioners so loyal to the particular clergyman that upon his departure the institution is left but a shell of its former self. Factory managers and foremen have been known to leave a company followed by all their key lieutenants.

It was a recognition of this truth which prompted Andrew Carnegie to say that he did not care what happened to his physical properties as long as his executive organization remained intact.

Also, devotion to the person of the leader may easily lead to failure to appreciate what he is trying to do. And when the personal costs of following where he intends to go are understood, defection begins to occur. These are samples of the real dangers involved and the sound leader will not forget to bear them in mind. He will try always to lead the followers beyond personal adulation. He will take hero worship not as a gratification of his own vanity but as a fact to be impersonally and humbly turned to the account of his cause.

The fact remains that the good leader will be willing and able to capitalize upon the need of his followers for a personal focus or symbol without trying to exploit it. And a wise organization in any field will insist that its leaders build up such relations with its members as will make them genuine personal symbols of the group purpose. One great weakness of many modern organizations, increasingly characterized as bureaucratic, is the unwillingness of leaders to be personal symbols and of organizations to encourage them to be. Indeed, that is what bureaucracy essentially means —a reliance upon procedures and precedents and a distrust of the exercise of personal power of true leadership caliber.

The remedy for that bureaucracy with which all organizations are threatened as they grow in size, lies to an appreciable degree in a recognition of the difference in function between the executive and the leader, and in the effort to extend the range and depth of the executive attitude and activity so that the personal influence of a leader is felt at every level.

CHAPTER V

THE LEADER'S OBJECTIVES

THE leader is doing his job when people are being influenced to cooperate toward *some goal which they come to find desirable.*

But what kinds of goals may they come to desire? What kinds of goals will appeal to people? How are the goals of organized groups determined, communicated to members and altered?

How does a leader know that his goals will prove attractive? How does he know that they have so proved themselves?

Answers to these questions are fundamental to any understanding of the leader's task. No idea of leadership which slights the crucial importance of sound objectives gets beyond the primary stages. For in the last analysis the leader is only as strong as his objectives are sound. A leader is known by the objectives he espouses.

In a world full of organizations—where some tend to be thought of as good just because they once served a purpose and still exist, and where some are justified because they succeed with an objective of "making money"—in such a world, to know what his organization is striving for is the first question the leader must ask. He must be certain that he has a sound and therefore an appealing purpose before he tries to win followers.

Indeed, today a critical scrutiny of objectives is one of the most crucial duties imposed upon many leaders, especially in those organizations which directly or

indirectly have to do with the efforts of people to get a living. It has become a commonplace to say that technically the resources are or might be available in western civilization to supply an adequate standard of material comfort for the entire population. And the fact that we fall far short of that attainment is generally recognized as having to do with the objectives of our economic and social institutions. The question is in whose interests are they being run? Are corporations which produce and distribute goods prompted only by a desire to make money, or do they wish also to serve society with a needed service?

If this question is to be frankly faced, the responsibility upon leaders—in the business, political and educational worlds—is a real one. They have to bring to their examination of the objectives of their several organizations a degree of candor and scientific disinterestedness which has heretofore been all too rare.

If any excuse be needed for placing disproportionate stress upon economic organizations in the subsequent discussion of the importance of sound objectives, it is to be found in the fact that they play such a large part in modern life and that their narrow and selfish objectives often tend to color and influence the aims of other organized groups as well.

DEFINITION OF GOALS

A goal, let us agree in advance, is an aim, purpose or objective which defines the field of desire and the direction of effort of an associated group of people.

Such fields may be of the most varied kinds. A few neighbors, interested in photography, organize a club to improve their artistic techniques and appreciation. A group of stamp collectors come together to exchange

stamps. A corporation is organized to manufacture and sell a product at a profit. A day nursery is founded to care for the babies of working mothers. A fire department exists to prevent and extinguish fires.

A further distinction which it is useful to observe is between primary and secondary aims or objectives, between basic and supplementary objectives.[1]

The members of a department of a factory, for example, may readily agree on the purpose of keeping a clean workroom or of getting out work ahead of schedule or of beating the accident record of another department. Such aims are secondary and useful. And the department leader may often be successful in furthering them without much practical relation in anyone's mind to the primary or basic objective of the corporation as a whole.

A conscientious corporation management might decide that if it could not do business at a profit and *at the same time* pay a living wage, manufacture a product of honest quality, and sell it with truthful representations and at reasonable discounts, it would prefer to go out of business. In such a case the objective of profit-making would of course be qualified and modified by other ethical objectives held to be of equal importance. (This instance could hardly be called typical!)

Indeed, it is probably true of many organized situations that one objective does not alone determine action, but rather that there is a balancing of factors among a number of objectives, all of which it is important to hold in view. And from a practical standpoint, the problem of the leader often is to get the several objectives into such a balance that as a whole they may be felt by the followers to be satisfactory—at least temporarily.

Moreover, in the motivation of many prominent business leaders, the existence of a single-minded urge to make money is undoubtedly much too simple an explanation of their lifelong striving. Motives of prestige, of power, of public service, of "playing a game," of creative satisfaction—all may enter to affect their decisions. And as they are thus influenced they cause the objectives of the organizations which they lead to become more complex. Even in such cases, however, the problem from the point of view of the led is whether they are being used merely as stepping stones for the leader's aims, or whether the net result of his motives does in fact tend to prove beneficial to them.

WHAT GOALS ARE APPEALING?

The goals of organized human effort are as diverse as human needs and human interests. They appeal because they give scope for activities which satisfy some traits in human nature or which meet some needs in human experience.

Aims have an appeal when the pursuit of them helps people to attain something they deeply desire. Aims are good aims from the individual's standpoint when they enhance his sense of selfhood and significance. No matter how completely the follower may seem to be willing to lose himself in the leader and his cause, the more profound truth is that the follower comes somehow to realize that he who loses himself will find himself. That eternal paradox of selflessness leading on to fuller selfhood is one of the central truths never to be lost sight of in the effort to understand and develop the relation of leader to follower. For the self of each follower must be served—in some one of an infinite

number of ways and through the multifarious channels of personal and group expression.

The demand upon the leader is to know the attr butes of the individual and to be aware of the characteristics of human nature. Every issue in leadership comes back to this: know the human organism, the manner of its behavior, the natural promptings of basic desire, the typical aspirations, the usual and possible modes of satisfaction, the conditions of happiness in a profound sense. The leader should be an expert in human nature—whether his knowledge is intuitive or acquired by conscious study.

The attainment of selfhood, the growth of a sense of individual worth-whileness, assurance that one *is* somebody, the firm establishment of one's ego—this is a primary and underlying need for everyone. It constitutes a basic motive in behavior. No good leader will ever forget this.

Each individual is a distinct center of a different organization of interests, based on the effort to fulfill in individual ways the underlying urges which he shares with every other human. The common elements are primarily controlling. We are bound together by ties which the importunities of the flesh create. We all must eat, be sheltered and seek love and esteem.

The individualizing elements are also present. Aptitudes, talents, capacities, temperaments and creative powers vary greatly from person to person.

Moreover, because of these individualized elements in human nature, knowledge of the special sources of each person's way to self-realization is largely a matter for self-discovery. Self-choice of outlets and modes of expression thus becomes virtually essential. Up to a point the necessity for such self-determination on the part of his followers is a fact which the leader loses sight

of at his peril. No matter how much the result of leader-ship may look like regimentation or uncritical mass action, the deeper truth is that in the long run the individual remains as a follower only as he believes that the mainsprings of his own life are thus given release and power.

The whole great significance of democratic leader-ship, no less than democratic philosophy, gets its under-lying validation at this point. The individual's own opportunity to select the group in which he will partici-pate becomes one of the profound criteria by which he rightfully judges whether its leader has a democratic aim.

If it be thought that all this is obvious, it should be pointed out that there are plenty of organized situations in modern life where this condition of free individual choice of objectives, and of membership in the groups which will achieve them, is still not satisfied. Business activity at once comes to mind as the outstanding instance of corporate groups in which individuals participate both without helping to formulate the aim or without affirmatively having the chance to say that they agree to share in forwarding it. They merely agree to come on the pay roll!

Typically the relation of the employee of a business enterprise to the management is one of master and servant, one of imperative necessity that the individual who is divorced from a means of livelihood shall take the available job as the condition of literal survival. Under present conditions of highly concentrated prop-erty ownership it is idle to talk of self-choice of creative work outlets and associations as the usual course, either for white-collared or for manual workers. For some millions of citizens "freedom of contract" is today a fiction when it concerns the earning of a living. And

the problem of exercising genuine leadership throughout our economic life is colored and complicated by the psychological difficulties and resistances which this condition creates.

How are executives to lead in any real sense those employees who feel that all they can get out of their job is the weekly pay envelope?

Where there is little or no option for the individual as to what group he joins, as to the leadership it supplies and as to the purpose it is seeking to realize, the attempt to lead instead of command *is handicapped at every point.*

Compare the attitude, the alertness, initiative and enthusiasm of the ordinary manual worker at his job by day, with his attitude toward his lodge, his labor union meeting, his church vestry, his singing club or his political clique. He may be a tractable follower in the latter mediums. He may have acquired habits of submission and passivity which lessen his assertiveness. But at the very least he is conscious in these groups of a right to stay or leave, to vote "yes" or "no," to "grouse" or commend—all of which privileges he fails to find in anything like the same degree at his job— unless, of course, he is fortunate enough to work for a company where he can participate in some truly autonomous and effective organization of workers in joint dealings with the corporate management.

Again, compare the working attitude of a man tinkering around his home, repairing his own automobile, working his own garden, or at any other self-elected avocational effort, with the attitude of the same man in the shop as an employee. In the one case you find a free flow of voluntary energy, in the other perhaps a sense of "let's do as little as we can and get away with it."

The wonder is that there is found as much creative interest among hired workers as does in fact exist. The wonder is that they show as much disposition as they do to follow an executive leader—when we realize that under typical conditions that leader has to be loyal to a higher leader in the person of the company superintendent who in turn has to be loyal to the interests of the stockholders (usually absentee) and to the aim of making the best possible profit showing for them.

What purposes—people should ask in all candor— have the usual department store buyer, the factory foreman and the office manager which are likely to be appealing to the rank and file?

Their cry is for more output, more sales, more economies, lower costs. And all for what end that relates itself closely to the desires of the workers as possible willing followers?

The one great desire of the members of such groups is to be sure that they are retained on the job. They try to please the management to the point where discharge or layoff will not take place. This is, of course, in large part a negative and *fear motive.* Positive motives, which *look toward self-realization in and through the working corporate relationship,* get their chance to function only with difficulty and occasionally. The role of the departmental and higher leaders in such situations thus becomes peculiarly challenging and difficult.

It is not implied that in these circumstances leadership is wholly unavailing. But until it can be exercised with fuller recognition of the need for a genuine attainment of personal fulfillment by the led, it will be deficient in a vital way. Just so long as the profit motive operates in an organization *without any relation to how the employees also profit* (both financially, in

status and in growth) the leader works under great limitations.

In short, this question of the kinds of objectives which will appeal to people is primary and crucial for the leader. The goals which people in groups will willingly serve and the leaders they will gladly follow *must appeal to the followers as supporting and extending the latter's efforts to establish their own egos and the concrete demands which enable those egos to grow.*

Each of us ultimately should decide for himself which are the channels in which our individualities are supported, released and expanded. Because of this truth, self-choice of the groups which we will join and a sharing in the choice and shaping of group objectives become basic conditions to be conformed to.

If it is pointed out that the individual does not always comprehend his own deeper desires and that one function of the leader is often to aid in this discovery, one hastens to agree. The leader on occasion is unquestionably one who can make us aware of impulses and aspirations in ourselves which we had not known were there. This process is frequent and indispensable. But the end result has reality and meaning only as the individual finds satisfaction through this process. The criterion is always in terms of the self which is released—in terms of a reaction which says, "Now I know myself and am myself more fully than was before possible or even imagined."

A goal may be novel and unexperienced. But it is accepted in any permanent way only as the individual finds through experience that it has the appeal which his identification with it alone can bring.

It should not be forgotten, however, that the leader often has the added duty of making it clear to people just what the experience they have had has taught

them. It is fallacious to assume that people will inevitably learn the right lesson from the raw impact of events upon them. Sometimes they have to be shown what it is they have learned and how they have benefited. When you hear someone say to a member of an organization, "You don't know how well off you are," the chances are that one of two things is true. Either the leaders in that organization have not been at pains to publicize effectually the objectives which control and the favorable results which seemingly accrue, or such a remark may be prompted by the existence of favorable but unappreciated conditions which have been paternalistically supplied and therefore are not appreciated because not self-obtained.

This raises a nice point which is stressed, not to be confusing, but to call attention to a real distinction. Certainly many corporate heads have been heard to say somewhat ruefully, "Our people don't seem to appreciate what we do for them. These outside agitators come along and the men believe anything they say and forget what we have been doing for them for the last twenty years." College professors (usually the less dynamic ones) have been known to say, "The boys don't seem to appreciate what we give them."

Are these instances of objectives and of efforts to realize them which the followers are too dumb to recognize as beneficial? Or are they rather examples of misguided judgment on the part of the leaders as to what was truly of real benefit to the followers?

Lincoln's remark about the ease of fooling all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but the difficulty of fooling all the people all the time, comes to mind in this connection. Both things will prove true. People will on occasion show poor judgment as to the efforts of a leader in their behalf.

And on occasion they will show an uncanny shrewdness in not wanting to have things done for them which they would rather do for themselves.

In general, as with company bands or ballgrounds or evening educational courses, we know that employees prize them more where they bear an appreciable part of the cost. The broad principle for leaders to hold in view, therefore, is that the experience of their followers has occasionally to be interpreted to them by the leader. It can only be convincingly interpreted as for their own good where the effort of gaining the benefits has been shared by the workers and has not merely been handed out by the leader.

OBJECTIVES IN ACTION

This discussion of appealing objectives should now be brought down to concrete cases. All of these are drawn from economic organizations because, as already suggested, the problem is most urgent there. And the need for a critical scrutiny of existing objectives is most required by the leader in such situations.

In suggesting the difficulties faced and the possible new objectives proposed to solve those difficulties, the intention is to act as a reporter rather than as an advocate of any special measures. What the following records suggest about the kinds of objectives sought and the results obtained under them tell pretty much their own story.

"Men Working, A Story of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company," contains a record of some of the earlier developments of labor relations in that company under the leadership of Paul W. Litchfield. Said Mr. Litchfield some years ago:

It seems almost a paradox that while politically we have advanced year by year and century by century from a

condition of master and slave to an enlightened and free republic, where every man has an equal voice in the government of, for and by the people, that we have during the last one hundred years been drifting, apparently, from a nation of free and independent business men to a condition where a very large part of our population has become wage-earners, almost entirely dependent upon the capitalist. . . .

The thing which is vitally wrong is the increased influence and power of combined capital over labor. This tendency and condition is at the bottom of the nation-wide unrest of labor and the constant clashes between labor and capital which are taking place, and will continue until a more just and satisfactory relationship between the two is evolved.

I stated above that the present business system was brought about by the efficient workman's becoming a capitalist, but it has gone beyond this point, and while efficient workmen still may become capitalists, it has not resulted in the control of business by efficient workmen but, largely, by capital in the abstract through inheritance, speculation and an unjust share of the profits which were not regulated properly in the past.

The solution of the trouble lies in the gradual change from the present monarchical form of business, controlled by capital, to a republican form of business, controlled by labor. This can be hastened by the education of labor to be able to take control, constructively conserving the rights of both labor and capital. This means the taking away of the special privileges which capital now has. It must be done by educating labor in the principles and practices of successful business, so they can intelligently engage in the production of wealth.

In the control of business by its active personnel two things must be considered:

1. The profits should be divided as nearly as possible in proportion as each man contributed to the production of these profits, not to each man sharing alike.

2. Wages should be based on what a man can produce and not upon the time he works; efficiency in production should be the measure of distribution and should bear relation to the wages paid.

This is not true, however, in the ultimate voting control of the business. It has been found practical that when a citizen-

ship is enlightened, it is safe to, let each citizen have an equal voice in the election of representatives to make the laws, barring citizenship to those who have not resided long enough in a place to understand the issues or who, by some mental or moral defect, are considered by the majority as unfit for citizenship.

The same principles will work out in business, no matter how large the corporation may be.

It was on the basis of this analysis of the shortcomings of the objectives of many corporations that Mr. Litchfield organized for the workers of his company the Goodyear Industrial University and later the Industrial Republic as a means of securing active and enlightened employee representation in decisions of management that affected the workers. Whether or not his company has been able by these plans to meet all of this executive's requirements as to the relation of workers to corporations is less important than that an active and successful executive should so honestly have voiced this view of the problem.

In similar vein, after the war when the General Electric Company had worked through some unhappy strike developments, Owen D. Young, according to his biographer,[2] asked himself: "Why were my men so bitter?" And he requested his assistant to take a file of the *Works News* of the Schenectady plant "and from it compile what seem to be the men's complaints, desires, ideals."

The report as quoted is highly suggestive of the shortcomings in the objectives of the corporation as the employees viewed them. It read:

1. The workmen feel that the foremen are inhuman beings who lack any sense of what the personal touch in business means.

2. The men desire to have some system of profit sharing or stock purchase plan inaugurated so as to take advantage

of the thrift instinct instilled during the Liberty Loan campaign.

3. They desire some sort of a representative plan.

4. They desire to have the welfare work increased so that it will be evident that the Company is taking a personal interest in them inside as well as outside of the plant.

5. They desire to have what might be called a "Manager of Man Power."

6. They desire to have thorough education and instruction - an opportunity for promotion and scientific selection of men and jobs.

How far the General Electric Company has gone under the leadership of Mr. Young and Mr. Gerard Swope toward instituting a program that would take account of these desires, it is impossible to set forth in detail. But the personnel policy and procedures of that company in their totality represent today a remarkable advance over conditions then. Mr. Young himself, in a famous and forward-looking address at the dedication of the buildings of the Harvard Graduate School of Business in 1927, included one paragraph which throws further light on this problem of objectives which will be appealing. He said:

Perhaps some day we may be able to organize the human beings engaged in a particular undertaking so that they truly will be the employer buying capital as a commodity in the market at the lowest price. It will be necessary for them to provide an adequate guaranty fund in order to buy their capital at all. If that is realized, the human beings will then be entitled to all the profits over the cost of capital. I hope the day may come when these great business organizations will truly belong to the men who are giving their lives and their efforts to them, I care not in what capacity. Then they will use capital truly as a tool, and they will be all interested in working it to the highest economic advantage. Then an idle machine will mean to every man in the plant who sees it an unproductive charge against himself. Then

every piece of material not in motion will mean to the man who see it an unproductive charge against himself. Then we shall have zest in labor, provided the leadership is competent and the division fair. Then we shall dispose, once and for all, of the charge that in industry organizations are autocratic and not democratic. Then we shall have all the opportunities for a cultural wage which the business can provide. Then, in a word, men will be as free in cooperative undertakings and subject only to the same limitations and chances as men in individual businesses. Then we shall have no hired men. That objective may be a long way off, but it is worthy to engage the research and efforts of the Harvard School of Business.

Still another interesting instance of corporate objectives, as broadened by the dealings of a company with the United Mine Workers of America, is found in the story of the Rocky Mountain Fuel Company under the leadership of its president and principal stockholder, Miss Josephine Roche.

After an ugly strike in the Colorado coal region, this company decided to go its own independent way and enter whole-heartedly into a collective agreement with the national union. The president at that time, Mr. M. D. Vincent, issued a statement which contained among others the following paragraphs:[3]

> The policy of the company will be based on the fact that the men employed are as much an essential factor in the industry as the capital invested in it and have independent rights in the determination of working and living conditions. . . .
>
> Recognition by each party in industry of the rights of the other is necessary for successful operation and permanent stability.
>
> Acting upon this principle the Rocky Mountain Fuel Company is putting into effect a policy which is based upon the fact that the men employed in the mines are as much an essential factor in the industry as the capital invested and

have the right to act upon equal terms with the investor
to determine working and living conditions.

We realize that this policy cannot be put into successful
operation over night, or even in a brief period of time—and
we find in talking with miners that they understand as well
as we do the importance of the time element in the situation.
Many complex problems, arising out of years of antagonism
and conflict, must be worked out before these plans can be
fully effective. The development of this policy will naturally
require full cooperation of the management and the men in
the mines. Upon mine superintendents and other mine
officials will rest a particularly heavy share of the responsi-
bility for its ultimate success.

On the strength of this statement of company objec-
tives, a collective agreement was negotiated in 1930,
which contained the following significant "declaration
of principles" or statement of common objectives:

We, the signers of this document, seeking a new era in the
industrial relations of Colorado, unite in welcoming this
opportunity to record the spirit and principles of this
agreement.

Our purposes are:

To promote and establish industrial justice;

To substitute reason for violence, confidence for misunder-
standing, integrity and good faith for dishonest practices,
and a union of effort for the chaos of the present economic
warfare;

To avoid needless and wasteful strikes and lockouts
through the investigation and correction of their underlying
causes;

To establish genuine collective bargaining between mine
workers and operators through free and independent
organization;

To stabilize employment, production and markets through
cooperative endeavor and the aid of science, *recognizing the
principle that increased productivity should be mutually
shared through the application of equitable considerations to
the rights of workers and to economic conditions affecting the
operations and business of the company;*

To assure mine workers and operators continuing mutual benefits and consumers a dependable supply of coal at reasonable and uniform prices;

To defend our joint undertaking against every conspiracy or vicious practice which seeks to destroy it; and in all other respects to enlist public confidence and support by safeguarding the public interest.

Appraising the results to date of the working of the joint agreement which gave these objectives effect, Miss Van Kleeck after a careful study speaks as follows:[4]

The important points in this record are that the company has more than held its own in the markets of the state; that its mine-operating profits have increased; that it has been able to pay every cent of interest on its bonded indebtedness on the dates due; and that it has maintained for the miners a wage scale set by agreement, and has increased their stability of employment. Its strength lies in its internal relationships and in what ought to be regarded as the most important phase of its operations, the productivity of labor and the goodwill characterizing relations between workers and management.

One more illustration, this time on the negative side, will have to suffice in this effort to relate objectives to the possibilities of real leadership.

M. S. Viteles in "The Science of Work"[5] quotes the observations of an employee in a utility company as follows:

The loyalty which the employees had for the Blank Public Service Company, he writes, was built up over a period of years to a point where it became a tradition. Every employee was certain that he was working for and was really part of the fairest and finest corporation in the world. . . .

This feeling reached its peak in 1930 . . . It had been furthered by employee benefit and stock plans, through employee representation and by similar activities. In the final analysis the workers' loyalty rested on "recognition"— on the feeling spread by management that the activity of

each worker was a vital factor in the success of the company. This means that praise was bestowed where deserved, and criticism given in a constructive spirit.

Along came the depression. Employees were let out; salaries were cut; part-time schedules were adopted. These measures were expected and seemed entirely justified. Those who remained on the pay roll made no complaint about their reduced earnings. They remained loyal. But the loyalty had already reached its peak and was about to make a speedy and complete disappearance.

"Things are different now" writes the employee Baxter, "things meaning employees' loyalty and attitude toward the Blank Public Service Company. The old loyalty is gone.

"Why has it gone? Who is responsible for its loss?", he asks. "Was the loss of loyalty unavoidable due to the business depression, or was it due to poor judgment on the part of the management?" The answer, he adds, is to be found in the shortsightedness of the supervisory force.

As the depression dragged along labor turnover was reduced to practically zero. This meant that every man in a supervisory capacity, if he was shortsighted, could consider that his labor problems had vanished. And the majority of those in supervisory capacities therefore welcomed what appeared to be the end of their labor problems. They saw their way open to be "real bosses," to handle their employees as they saw fit, with no fear of a worker quitting. And so the attitude toward the worker became, in the words of the average supervisor, *you ought to be glad you've got a job.*

When the worker hears this from his supervisor, it means but one thing—"that his company wants him to know that they now have him where they want him." The employees of the Blank Public Service Company, except those fortunate enough to have supervisors with a knowledge of true values, had this remark thrown at them many times. Of course, the purpose of such a statement is to make a man work harder and better. In effect, by destroying "loyalty"— the will-to-work-together—it tends to produce exactly the opposite reaction. This attitude on the part of the supervisor could only mean that the part of an employee's return which has been called "recognition" had ceased. And without recognition loyalty cannot survive.

"This same loyalty," writes Baxter, "which has successfully withstood long hours, overtime, poor working conditions, distasteful work, labor troubles and innumerable other tests which arose throughout the years had finally met its master. Before the onslaught of the attitude typified by the statement, "You ought to be glad you've got a job," employee loyalty was annihilated. In a few months the supervisory force threw away a valuable asset accumulated only through long years of patient recognition.

This loss of loyalty has already resulted in a decrease in efficiency. Moreover it has placed the worker in a position where nothing binds him to the company except the fact that he cannot now get a job elsewhere. As business conditions change and normal times return, many employees will undoubtedly take the first opportunity to secure another job, and the Blank Public Service Company will have a serious labor turnover problem on their hands. It will also have the more serious problem of trying to build up again, against the handicap of prejudice and mistrust, the loyalty and favorable employees' attitude which shortsighted supervisors so lightly threw away.

Considerable space has been devoted to these company experiences because in each case it is conclusively suggested that companies with the conventional, old-fashioned objectives are laboring under handicaps in their efforts to have executive leaders develop morale among those they are trying to lead. The increasingly articulate demands of workers for adequate incomes, for opportunity to learn and to advance, for security of job tenure, for some share in the final outcome of the business, for protection against the basic risks of accident, sickness, old age and unemployment, for a more effective voice in control and in negotiating terms of employment—these demands and the desires behind them are aspirations of which the leaders in organizations in the economic world must take account as they ask themselves what objectives will win loyalty.

Certainly the truth is unassailable that, only as leaders have objectives which their followers can reasonably agree to, will those who work for them agree that they *are* leaders and not bosses, and follow them as such.

Let the leader, therefore, occasionally ask himself with the utmost candor—and let him ask his group too by every means at his disposal—the question: *Are the controlling objectives of this organization of such a character that the members may reasonably be expected to strive enthusiastically for them?*

Of course, in trying to answer this question he must distinguish sharply between statements of purpose as these may be spread on the minute books of the board of directors or as formulated in public speeches by himself, and the way in which they are interpreted *in action* by every department head. For objectives count only to the extent that the rank and file experience them in the way the line executives conduct the hour-by-hour work of leading. Objectives are no better than the leader's translations of them into actions.

HOW ARE GROUP OBJECTIVES DETERMINED AND INTERPRETED?

It may be objected, however, that so much emphasis upon the characteristics and demands of the followers implies too slight a recognition of the creative or transcendent role of the leader.

Yet, in considering how objectives are discovered, given form and interpreted, there comes at once an opportunity to alter the perspective and correct a too one-sided emphasis. For the leader's role always has two aspects. From one point of view he is the mouth-piece, the symbolized embodiment of agreed objectives

the articulator, the truly representative man. To this extent he does not create objectives. He precipitates them; he dramatizes them; he gives them persuasive appeal.

From another point of view it is the leader who plays a large part in creating and defining in novel ways what may be worth-while purposes. He sees deeper and further what will prove valuable and acceptable to the group. He pioneers in daring to state and to strive for heretofore unconceived ends which he believes will prove desirable.

A simple illustration of the first type of leading— where objectives are readily acknowledged—follows. A few neighbors in conversation are lamenting the high tax rate on their homes or the excessive assessed valuations on their property. Finally some one says, "What can we do about it?" The suggestion is made that they interest a few others up and down the adjoining streets and that they hold a meeting. At this point Mr. A. offers the use of his house for the meeting or says he will arrange for the use of the church vestry or the school hall. He concludes the arrangements, notices are sent out and the meeting is held. Mr. A., having secured the meeting place, is asked by the original group of neighbors to act as temporary chairman.

He opens the meeting with a statement of the problem. The general objective is clear; it is to do whatever is possible to secure a reduction in the tax rate or of assessed valuations or both. Only those are in attendance who are directly concerned with the objective and are already more or less favorable to it. Mr. A., who is now made permanent chairman, becomes the leader, and by the end of the evening the Blanktown Taxpayers' Association has come into being with Mr. A. as president.

In this instance the objective arises out of the group's
need. It is stated; and membership in the association
at once implies adherence to its major aim. It becomes
a relatively easy matter to commend this aim to more
neighbors. And the problem for the leader is here one
of helping to give effect to the purpose.

It appears that Mr. A. is a lawyer; he knows the
mayor and his wife's cousin is on the board of assessors.
His role as leader is creative in the realm of ways and
means and sustained, effective action. In this instance
his relation to the formulation of objectives is not the
determining factor in his success.

But suppose the case of the steering committee of a
national political party not at present in office, which
is about to embark on its campaign for a new presi-
dential election. The upshot of much preliminary
conferring is "We must have a big issue on which to
wage our battle." In a limited sense it may be said
that the objective is given—to get the party into office.
But more deeply the issue is: what are the public ques-
tions on which a new and different stand can be taken
which will commend our cause to the electorate; what
will be an appealing objective?

It is at this point that a real leader may come forward
with a conviction as to popular desires and a program
or platform which is different enough to be creative,
yet familiar enough in trend and temper to be sym-
pathetically received. Such a leader has, within
limits, the chance to create objectives and to enlist
support for them to just the extent that he has sensed
the mood of the times.

Occasionally in a business corporation an executive
will come forward and protest that the reactions of the
public are not being taken sufficiently into account, or
that favorable employee sentiment should be more

aggressively sought. Whether or not his motive in making such comment is solely to increase profits or is influenced by other considerations, at the moment when he proposes policies or methods which look to improved public or employee goodwill, he is offering new and broader objectives. He has become a leader in the determination and broadening of aims. And to the extent that he puts his ideas across with his board of directors and the new policies win the approval and support of the public and the workers, he has performed a significant act of leadership.

He has helped to broaden corporate aims beyond quick and easy profits for stockholders, to the more complex objective of making a profit within the limits which efforts to secure public approval and employee morale may also dictate.

The process of arousing support for any aim is often a crucial one for the leader. Suppose an executive wants to put through a ten per cent wage cut in the interest of the long-time financial stability of his company. How can he gain employee support for such an unpopular course? This raises all the critical questions. Do the employees trust him? Do they feel that previously they have been frankly and honestly dealt with? Does a disinterested view of all the facts confirm the executive's judgment as to the necessity for the reduction? Will his case as set forth to the employees seem to them a defensible one? Are the future prospects of the company such as will give the employees assurance that a temporary sacrifice is to their long-run interests?

The successful interpretation and acceptance of policies or of objectives depend, in short, upon the degree to which people can discover that interests and desires close to their lives are being taken adequate account of. At this point the integrity of his cause will make or

break the leader. At this point his complete candor must be supported by the logic and soundness of all the facts. Here, too, his clarity of interpretation is essential. Here it is that publicity, research, persuasiveness and reputation for fair dealing come to useful fruition and issue in a unifying of aims. Or their absence brings failure.

The leader can and should pioneer into new realms of purpose derived from his own insight, from pooled thinking with his associates and from the pressure of events pointing to new aims. But in the last analysis he relies upon the likelihood of acceptance by the group. This raises a question which must presently be faced as to whether the leader can gauge in advance how popular his new aims will be.

But first, mention should be made of the methods of acquainting followers with the objective. This presents no special problem where the group simultaneously discovers a common need, as in the case of the taxpayers just cited. Nor does it present great difficulties where all members currently may participate in the control of an organization—as would be true, for example, in a consumers' cooperative society. But it is a real problem in organizations such as corporations, institutions and governmental departments or bureaus, into which new workers are hired with little or no prior knowledge of aims and no organized chance to share in formulating, interpreting or altering them.

In such cases objectives become known by the results they yield in the satisfaction obtained by the followers. The principle which seems to grow inevitably out of this analysis is that only as followers are *allowed to be parties* to the critical review and future modification of objectives, will these be soundly conceived and convincingly interpreted. There is all the difference in

the world between situations, (now all too typical) where executives *tell* workers what the associated aims are, and those where all the workers *are given the opportunity to join in creating, affirming and altering them.*

Take, for instance, two contrasted situations having to do with the release of workers—due in one case to technological improvements and in the other to a consolidation of plants. In the former situation a strong collective agreement with a union prevailed; in the latter there was an employee representation plan or company union.

The Chicago corporation which dealt with the union was forced to lay off over two hundred men because of the introduction of new machinery. The policy to be followed here was from the start subject to joint conference between company and labor-union leaders. A dismissal wage of five hundred dollars per worker was finally agreed upon, as easing the blow of the lay-off and giving the men some income while they looked for other jobs.

In the New England corporation where a whole plant was closed down, the method used was the sending of a telegram from the New York office to the local manager on a Friday announcing that the plant was to be closed the next Monday. In this case there was no conferring and no redress. The local people were powerless to protect themselves. Objectives were in control which they had no share in making or in interpreting.

To allow the members of a group some vital share in defining and achieving purposes and policies surely seems the only wise way. The members are, to say the least, only thus forewarned and forearmed. And more positively, only thus are they able to contribute their real and helpful ideas as to how they feel, what they desire and how new plans should be given effect.

It is easy, too easy, to tell a hospital nurse what the hospital exists to do, or to tell a bank clerk the bank's aim. The fact is that such telling has proved in thousands of instances to bring no inner conviction and agreement among the followers.

The followers require more than this, if they are really to come into the fold. They require —often unconsciously to themselves— *to be made partners and sharers in the determination of what the group is trying to do.* Only so do they have that kind of experience which alone brings loyalty.

What has proved true in religion, in armies and in politics has *to be made true in the other kinds of corporate* efforts. *People require the leader to help show them and give them the experience which convinces them that their loyalty to the group is a good thing for them.* And that experience involves today far more than blind trust in the leader—valuable though this may have been in the past. It involves sharing with the leader in deciding what is to be done and how. The ways to achieve that sharing require ingenuity to discover and goodwill to create.

The fact that present institutional objectives may be rigid—may be bureaucratic, perfunctory, complacent and selfish—does not remove the obligation upon the leaders to strive for the change. Leaders in the modern world will be all but useless if they do not grasp the fact that too many institutions are now controlled by objectives which cannot humanly appeal to those enrolled as member-workers.

Reference is made here not merely to institutions dominated by motives of struggle for competitive profits or for monopolistic income advantage. Those numerous organizations are also included where the sheer momentum of carrying on seems the dominant end, where the organization seems to have become an end in itself.

In this category it is all too, possible to find many churches, philanthropies, government bureaus and educational institutions. Wherever so-called leaders are just going through familiar motions, keeping themselves secure in established jobs and in general reiterating the aims of other days, the objectives nominally in operation will fail utterly to fire the rank and file. There comes a sort of living death. And until the objectives are subjected to the inevitably life-giving criticism of the entire organization, the loyalty which can be attained in such groups is a hollow sham of the real thing.

At a number of universities there have occurred in recent years some stimulating and constructive efforts on the part of the students themselves who became disgusted with outworn and stereotyped methods of instruction and curriculum building. The reports of these several student committees helped appreciably to bring a fresh breath of life and new, vital purpose into institutions where the educational leadership had become more nominal than real. Indeed the "youth movements" in political parties and character-building institutions and the protestant groups in prison management and church affairs are further examples of efforts to revitalize a moribund leadership by a push up from the bottom.

The wise leader, in a word, is the leader who welcomes and invites the deliberation of his followers upon the worth and relevancy of the objectives being served. In this way alone will they be proof against becoming antiquated, narrow, static and unappealing.

HOW CAN THE LEADER ANTICIPATE THE RECEPTION OF HIS PROPOSALS?

In general, if the leader is astute enough to know what his followers will desire, he has no problem here. But

the greater the leader ,the greater the probable dis-
crepancy between his vision of what is good and
the popular and immediate reaction of his followers
as to what is desirable.

In the larger issues of human progress it has been
true that the leader labored under a relentless compul-
sion which left the question of what people thought
about his views quite out of the range of his concerns.
Christ on the cross, Socrates drinking the hemlock,
Luther at Worms, Galileo before the papal court—these
and countless others were making no grandstand
plays nor were they supported by the thought that
history would reverse the contemporary verdict. They
all, like Luther, said in effect, "I can do no other."

No discussion of this aspect of the question can ignore
the truth that a strong inner urge and a lofty vision
mark the great leader as so confident of the absolute
rightness of his stand that what his followers may think
becomes of no conscious consequence to him. He is
secure in the belief that in the long run the right, as he
sees it, will prevail.

But in the lesser affairs of life a less heroic stand has
its place, and a more immediately persuasive influence
is called for. And, as we have seen, people will follow
if they can be made to see that the direction being
taken is good for them. This by no means implies that
what is "good for them" is being selfishly or narrowly
construed. Many a war has been fought by men led to
die believing death better than the endurance of condi-
tions deemed intolerable. Captains and crews have
gone down on foundering ships while women and
children passengers rowed safely away. Men have spent
their last ounce of strength and their last penny to
advance causes which seemingly looked lost in their
lifetime.

In all such instances the leader—in the highest sense—has been able to convince others that "the good" lay in efforts that were personally sacrificial for them in the extreme.

But in less heroic situations the leader will know in advance how compelling his aims are by having faith that people, once they can get a taste of awareness of their own real selfhood, will follow in his train. He can anticipate the reception of his objectives by being sure that they will be interpreted as making life more profoundly worth while for his followers.

HOW ARE OBJECTIVES PROVED SUCCESSFUL?

The great test of success for the leader is the outcome. More happens in the group in the direction of gratifying results. The discovery of ways to self-fulfillment is more successful; the attained satisfaction is more profound. Morale becomes a glowing and sustaining fact, felt by all and strengthening all.

Leadership, it cannot be too often stressed, is not a matter of hypnosis, blandishment or "salesmanship." It is a matter of leading out from within individuals those impulses, motives and efforts which they discover to represent themselves most truly. It is a matter of having individuals find in associated effort under wise direction that their personal power is multiplied, personal desires are integrated and personal sensibility is heightened.

Leadership is known by the personalities it enriches, not by those it dominates or captivates. Leadership is not a process of exploitation of others for extraneous ends. It is a process of helping others to discover themselves in the achieving of aims which have become intrinsic to them. The proof of leading is in the qualitative growth of the led as individuals and as group members. Any other test is trivial and unworthy.

Chapter VI

THE QUALITIES NECESSARY IN LEADERS

A COMMON-SENSE consideration of the qualities typically found in leaders will make it easier to set forth the practical steps which the individual can take toward self-improvement. Deficiencies in qualities which can be cultivated by conscious effort can undoubtedly be lessened. Good qualities can be strengthened. Not all the desirable attributes, however, are equally capable of self-cultivation. Some are more innate than others.

Any list of necessary qualities will be arbitrary at best. It is idle to pretend to conduct such a discussion in a scientifically acceptable, psychological vocabulary. The important thing is to draw on a wide study and observation of leaders with a view to offering a statement of qualities which are readily identified in practical experience, even though the traits discussed are often compounded of several elements if viewed in strictly psychological terms.

All of these qualities, however, do not necessarily appear in every leadership situation nor are they all equally required of every leader. The aim is rather to present a comprehensive picture—a synthetic model—of all the ideally desirable qualifications. The task of self-cultivation or of formal training in leadership qualities is thus to be viewed as helping to strengthen those traits which may at one time or another be brought into use.

For convenience the qualities to be considered will be grouped under ten designations, each of which will be discussed in detail. The ten which together seem ideally desirable are:

1. Physical and nervous energy (Chapter VI).
2. A sense of purpose and direction (Chapter VI).
3. Enthusiasm (Chapter VI).
4. Friendliness and affection (Chapter VI).
5. Integrity (Chapter VI).
6. Technical mastery (Chapter VII).
7. Decisiveness (Chapter VII).
8. Intelligence (Chapter VII).
9. Teaching skill (Chapter VIII).
10. Faith (Chapter XIV).

PHYSICAL AND NERVOUS ENERGY

Almost every study of the secret of the successful leader has agreed that the possession of a generous and unusual endowment of physical and nervous energy is essential to personal ascendancy. Those who rise in any marked way above the mass of men have conspicuously more drive, more sheer endurance, greater vigor of body and mind than the average person. The leader's effectiveness is in the first instance dependent upon his basic constitutional strength and robustness.

The subtle ways in which one person vitalizes another are closely related to the possession of this endowment. Energy seems to be imparted and to be drawn out of others by an effective show of energy. The leader's energy begets energy in the followers. The existence of abounding vigor goes far toward making the leader crave to work for significant purposes, and toward producing that total mobilized zeal we call enthusiasm. Each of us knows in our day-to-day life

how our working effectiveness and ability to expend effort fluctuate with our physical and nervous condition. Sluggishness, apathy, chronic fatigue, routine execution—these are foes of good leadership which only abounding energy can keep at bay.

The leader also must recognize that his job is more demanding than the average. Strength literally goes out from him. Leading is hard work. It usually requires more average working hours than are given by others. It often requires sustained, concentrated effort; it requires occasional emergency demands which must be able to draw on physical reserves of strength and endurance. By his enthusiasm the leader makes unusual demands upon himself. Leading means a generous lavishing of energy which is abnormally taxing.

All this places a premium upon knowing how to make the most of and how to use to best advantage one's whole bodily equipment. The feeling of complete fitness, of facing each new day clear-eyed and fresh with a zest to be at the appointed task—an eagerness for action and sense of well-being in action—this is a priceless asset to be conserved at all costs.

Where, then, does this energy come from?

The physical and nervous constitution of each of us is determined by three kinds of influence: (1) by inheritance; (2) by the kind of early upbringing and nurture provided; and (3) by our conscious use or abuse of our physical organisms from day to day.

Although our physical inheritance stands in one sense as given and unalterable, it is important to realize how vitally our lives are conditioned by stature, by the functioning of the autonomic system and by our glandular organization. Medical research is not at present able to offer much assistance in the control of these factors. Yet there are plenty of instances of

weakling boys who by conscious determination have surmounted their tendencies to tuberculosis or anemia or other debility and come out with robust bodies. And it remains true that the exceptional person will transcend severe physical handicaps, even using them to his advantage. But this proves little for the rest of us. Such individuals become leaders in spite of, rather than because of, their handicaps. Those who are natively less exceptional must be sure that they are making the most effective use of their physical equipment.

As to the role of early environment, it is interesting to observe from recent studies[1] that *in the aggregate* those who have become recognizable leaders have come from homes of middle class circumstances where physical and mental surroundings were favorable to development.

Bearing in mind the numerous exceptions which everyone could cite, it seems true that those who will be predisposed to marked leadership talents are likely to be a little taller and a little heavier than normal,[2] will have come from parents of superior energy and intelligence, and will have been brought up in fairly comfortable homes where they received adequate nourishment and physical care and had the stimulus of contact with families and associates of more than average intelligence.

"Men who distinguish themselves in their youth above their contemporaries," Lord Macaulay is said to have observed—and this is confirmed by recent studies—"almost always keep to the end of their lives the start which they have gained."

The kind of germ plasm from which one starts, in short, and the kind of early environment enjoyed go a long way toward aiding or detracting from potential leadership power. If these are facts, it is well to have

them in view, even if most of us cannot at this stage do anything about it for ourselves.

What we can definitely do something about is the way in which we conserve and expend the energies we now possess. There are certain practices we can avoid and certain others we can affirmatively embrace. Each of us can study himself and his inner working enough to know those things which he should *not* do if he would keep his organism at concert pitch. It is not difficult to discover the limits to our endurance and to our recuperative powers. Nor are these matters of a complicated nature. They have to do with the simple things in the conduct of daily living—with food, sleep, fatigue, stimulants, sexual activity, worry and the like.

The important thing is each individual's attention to his own peculiar difficulties of internal chemistry and nervous reaction. Self-knowledge on this physical side is essential. Thorough, periodic physical examination can unquestionably be of great value in assuring that executive leaders are not developing conditions which detract from their total effectiveness. The danger signals of aches and pains, chronic fatigue, inability to concentrate, irritability, insomnia and all the rest should be taken seriously both by the individual himself and by his associates who are concerned to see that he keeps fit. Good health and a feeling of free-flowing energy and positive zest in activity are normal. Something is wrong when they are absent.

One does not need to be a chronic valetudinarian to study one's own mechanism carefully enough to be able to conserve vital resources and to try to remove conditions which impair them. Observation of executives in various kinds of organizations indicates that far too little attention is given today to assuring the maximum creation of personal energy and its effectively

directed use. This problem needs more attention both by the individual and by the organization in which he is leading.

Organizations tend to put a premium upon a display of sheer activity or busyness and upon constant physical presence on the job. Yet the values which leadership peculiarly demands are not cultivated by a flurry of constant action. More thoughtfulness, more chance for meditation, for serenity, for using one's imagination, for developing one's total personal effectiveness and poise, for being more straightforwardly human with one's associates—these are required. And these values flourish where there is physical well-being. People who are going to lead have to be rested and fresh; they need enough vacations and holidays to assure this. They need time to think about the aims and problems of their organization. And their working schedules should allow for this.

Also, the leader's problem is often not one of building up energy but of knowing how to expend it judiciously. Many leaders waste energy by misapplying it. They lavish too much strength on coping with details, on impulsive order-giving because they suddenly "get a hunch," on nervously trying to speed up the working pace of others. They pour out energy on everything except on keeping themselves wholesome, vigorous, sane and persuasive—as those charged with influencing the motives and fostering the morale of others should be.

The great need here is to get the organization to have a policy about the conservation of its leader's energies; and to get the leader to conduct his own living in such a way that energy flows freely and happily.

Attainment of the total bodily exhilaration which is so desirable for the leader will also require attention to the mental side of life. Distinctions between "bodily"

and "mental" are artificial; we are in our behavior all
of a piece. Whatever affects one part of the individual
affects the whole. We act, react and interact throughout
our whole beings all the time. But knowledge of the
symptoms, consequences and measures of therapy for
predominantly mental disturbances has increased so
greatly in the last twenty years that it will be folly to
ignore this aspect. Chapter XII will be devoted to a
detailed examination of the special dangers to which
leaders are exposed from such causes. Here only the
briefest mention of the relation of mental troubles to
the free flow of energy will be made.

Just because of his possession of greater than normal
energy, the leader may frequently find it somewhat
difficult to canalize it in wholesome ways. One occasion-
ally hears the comment that a certain leader "has so
much energy he doesn't know what to do with it." And
often this remark carries with it the implication that he
misdirects or wastes his talents. Perhaps he does not
know how to relax from his work; perhaps he fritters
away his energies on trivial avocations. Also he should
be careful that in the process of leading he is not finding
outlet for some unwise and extreme sublimation or
some compensation for repressed desires or interests.
If he has what the psychiatrist calls mental fixations,
obsessions or other complexes, these are in danger of
making his behavior with his followers too zealous, too
rigid or too self-centered.

Here is a relatively simple instance of how this kind
of manifestation can disturb the proper flow of energy.
An executive who lost his wife and only child in an
automobile accident decided to "throw himself com-
pletely into his work" in order to forget his troubles
and absorb all his energies. As a result he developed
an extraordinary drive, working himself every evening

and requiring much overtime from his staff. At the end of a year he had a nervous breakdown and much to the relief of his organization had to take a three-months rest.

Inextricably and in ways we do not fully understand, the total supply and manner of expression of the energy of both men and women are interrelated with and strongly supported by their sexual energy. Energy is mysteriously fed from the springs of sexual desire. Greater total energy frequently means a stronger sex urge—with its consequent hazards for the leader. Where this is true, there is great need of assurance that sexual interests contribute effectively to harmonious living and do not become a divisive force draining energy away from an integrated expression.

One does not need to be dominated by any special school of psychological thought to realize that mental maladjustments originating in sexual causes are probably much more common than those arising from all other causes put together. And the personal hygiene of leadership must take the most candid account of the losses to its effectiveness which can develop from this quarter. The more completely unified, wholesome and personally felicitous the love life which the individual enjoys, the more nearly will his or her total behavior tend to be free of detracting mental influences and maladjustments.

The difference between a poor and good leader, it should be emphasized, is in all too many cases the difference between a congested liver and a normal one; or a hyper-thyroid condition and a sound one; or a low blood pressure and a normal one; or chronic food poisoning and a guided diet. Or it is the difference between a man with a shrewish, nagging wife at home and one whose wife is a good companion; or a man who

does not marry because of a mother fixation and one no
longer tied to his mother by too much affection; or a
man harassed by the anxiety of supporting numerous
children or in-laws on a small pittance and one without
money troubles.

The first and basic requirement of the leader is to
develop an abundance of red-blooded, free-flowing
energy!

Finally, a necessary part of the leader's role as an
energizer is some power to *dramatize* his energy. He will
do well in this connection to be mindful of his personal
appearance—in order to add visual confirmation to the
sense of robustness he would create. It will help if he
looks forceful, vigorous and energetic. It helps too if he
acts energetically on appropriate occasions.

Everyone has seen teachers, executives, group leaders
and others who were so desultory, so unawake, so
sluggish, in the manner and effect of their presence that
they gave nothing. They aroused no special attention
or interest despite the fact that what they were trying
to do was worth while. On the other hand, there are
those who can so quicken their own utterances and
actions as literally to "hold the center of the stage"
in whatever gathering they enter. They galvanize
attention in their energetic direction.

Where this talent is given histrionic emphasis it is
not to be considered meretricious, and the ability to
dramatize energy is not the less valuable for being
deliberately cultivated. What some leaders do intuitively,
others can learn to do if they possess the judgment, taste
and cleverness to have the resultant conduct appear
spontaneous and sincere.

The leader is entitled, if not required, *to invest his
cause with some excitement and glamor.* The energy he
displays in espousing it is a big factor in this glamor.

The cause becomes attractive, attention-compelling and provocative to the led. Surely the leader is deficient in psychological astuteness if he does not consciously try to "put himself over" with a contagious display of energy. People have the right to expect that within limits he will *put on a good show*.

This does not mean, of course, that he should use the energetic and magnetic qualities of his person to advance himself. It means rather that he should use himself as a symbol to advance his cause. There is always the danger that this vital distinction will be forgotten. But in action there is a vast difference between the leader's appearing to be the "big I," and his appearing as the personal focus of a big and inspiring idea.

Not only do the followers like to be aroused, attracted and energized, but they actually *have to be*. The greatest danger of some leaders is that their appeal remains too intellectual, too reasoned, too much in the realm of ideas. Such appeals, broadly speaking, are doomed to relative ineffectiveness with most people. For people are stirred as their feelings are stirred, as the deeper, emotional parts of their natures are appealed to. Vigor and forcefulness have compelling power. When an individual can utilize these forces to give the needed emotional attraction to his cause, he *is* a leader. And he is wise in knowing how energy propagates itself.

We should never forget that people *love to be led*. The experience releases something in them which wants release and in the expression of which they find contentment. They become identified with a strong force outside themselves into which with others they can pour their own increasing energy and, thus feel a harmony of oneness with a power bigger than themselves. The leader's show of energy helps to release energy.

Another important value in an abundance of energy should be mentioned. The *ability to persevere* in the face of discouragement and disappointment and the possession of *courage* to face strong opposition are both qualities which mark successful leaders. And both of these qualities are fed at their roots by an endowment of energy. Probably no single corroding influence eats away perseverance and courage so much as fatigue and bodily unfitness. Both the buoyancy of the outlook and the constancy of the effort of all of us derive from forces not primarily of the mind but of the body. When the leader begins to question whether "what I am trying to do is worth doing," the chances are that he needs a rest.

Amusing testimony along these lines is to be found in the following comment on Sidney Smith:[3]

> The older he grew the more convinced he became that "digestion is the great secret of life, and that character, talents, virtues and qualities, are powerfully affected by beef, mutton, pie-crust, and rich soups." All the miseries of body and mind proceeded from indigestion, and young people should be taught the moral, intellectual and physical evils of it. He believed that old friendships could be destroyed by toasted cheese, that lobster followed by tart could bring on an abnormal state of depression, that suicide had been caused by hard salted meat, and that a morsel of indigestible food was enough to produce a pessimistic outlook on life. To keep healthy and therefore happy, one must follow the common rules: exercise without fatigue, generous living without excess, early rising and moderation in sleeping.

Finally a word should be said on the obscure topic of the rhythms of energy in the life of the individual—and, indeed, of organizations as well. Growth of self-knowledge should gradually bring any individual leader to realize that neither he nor his followers can maintain

the maximum outpouring of energy all the time. There is inevitably a certain organic rhythm of intake and outgo, of reflection or inspiration and action, of priming and discharging. And if the leader is an unusual dynamo of sustained energy, he must not forget that his followers are not so highly charged. He should give them time to follow through, once a line of action is marked out. His own intensity often threatens him with impatience and "nerves" at the slowness of human change.

Modern armies plan to keep men at the front for only limited periods of time. Troops which have just won a battle are sent to the rear for recuperation. Every moment cannot be a victory. Occasions which give the basic satisfactions of victory have to be spaced. And the wise leader in every organization will try to provide that *periodically there are created situations for which energy is superlatively mobilized and from which results that are essentially victories can be achieved.*

It is further true in the natural history of organizations that they often seem to go through periods which are analogous to youth, the prime of life and old age. How far this rhythm is due to the rise and decline of leaders it is hard to say. But it is conceivable that the youthful vigor of newly organized groups bears a close relation to the vigor of its leaders, so that leaders who are old in spirit tend to create around them organizations from which the fires of enthusiasm are gradually burning out. This whole subject merits close scientific study, for it is of the utmost importance to know more about the factors which contribute to the rise and fall of those organizations and institutions which would seem to have justification for useful continuance. The role of leaders as conditioning factors in such cycles is probably a prominent one.

A SENSE OF PURPOSE AND DIRECTION

The second quality which is clearly prominent in every good leader is a strongly developed sense of a dominant purpose and direction. The leader is one who knows with greater than average strength of conviction what he wants to get done and where he wants to go. "The world stands aside to let pass the man who knows whither he is going."

This means that he possesses clarity and precision as to the objectives, purposes or aims that he desires for himself and his group, and that he holds these deeply enough and permanently enough to see them well on the way to being realized. Purposefulness to be effective requires that the aims sought are: (1) definite; (2) readily communicable to others; (3) potentially attractive to others; and (4) vigorously, persistently and enthusiastically sustained by the leader.

Purposes arise, as already suggested, in one of three typical ways. First, the purpose is given by a going group, and the directing person is chosen as the one to give the lead in realizing it. Second, the purpose is partly given and the leader, however he may arise, has the opportunity to broaden and enrich it. Third, the leader has to a considerable extent formulated the purpose and leads by virtue of his ability to rally others to it.

A brief characterization of these three types of relationship will help to throw light on the several ways in which a strong sense of purpose is needed by the leader. In education, for example, the teacher at once stands as the potential leader of his students with purposes more or less accepted in advance. And the measure of his success lies usually in the definiteness and vigor of his understanding as to what and why he

is teaching. His justifiable purpose may be, for example, to increase their historic perspective, their intellectual disinterestedness, their scientific point of view or their esthetic appreciation. To the extent that he holds a vivid view of what education can do for his students and to the extent that this view underlies and gives glamor to all he says and does, will his success as a teacher be assured.

There are teachers who pursue their calling as a pleasant and gracious career, as an easy means to security and prestige, as allowing time for research or other activities. They have their reward. But they never become leaders in the challenging job of educating the young. Whatever purpose they have runs parallel to their labors; it does not truly vitalize the actual teaching.

It is probably true that the second situation—the cases where purposes are partly given and partly to be created—are among those most frequently met. A trade association secretary is engaged to promote the best interest of his industry. But what those interests are, what common ends the members of the industry should wisely espouse, what new reaches of cooperative effort they should strive to attain—these are not a fixed quantity. These are aspects of purpose regarding which he either makes good as a leader by the compelling force of his creative imagination and persuasive power, or remains a perfunctory titular director of already established policies.

The same is true of executives in philanthropic and character-building agencies, in many corporations, institutions and public governmental departments and bureaus. At one level they direct the work of others at a routine task. The purpose is only to meet the obvious demands of responsibility for getting certain things

done. But at the higher level of leadership, the quality
of purposefulness is more original, more forward-look-
ing, more concerned to transform perfunctory routine
into enthusiastic participation in realizing common
ends.

There is a world of difference between a nominal
pursuit of purpose dimly perceived and a hearty
espousing of a purpose clearly conveyed. Yet this
nominal pursuit of aims perfunctorily taken for granted
is frequently met in organizations today.

The superintendent of a hospital, for example, has
the obvious and worthy purpose of directing the efforts
of his entire staff to the end that the sick people under
his care shall be made well. But what that means in
the attitude and conduct of *every* member of the institu-
tion's personnel is not always realized. Are patients
being helped to keep cheerful and happy? Are floor
washers, orderlies, laundry workers and dish washers
appreciative that *they* contribute to speedy recovery
and clean and happy environment in vital ways? Is the
training of nurses and internes being put ahead of rapid
rehabilitation of patients? These are only samples of
the questions the head executive should ask himself
and should seek concretely to work on. He becomes a
true leader when he attempts by personal contact,
training efforts and morale-building programs of various
kinds to have every worker know what the hospital
is trying to do, how each one is contributing to the
effort—when, in short, he is dramatizing the noble and
appealing purpose of his organization to every single
one of its humblest members.

Vivid appreciation of group purpose and agreement
with it add dignity to each individual's efforts. Only
so are tasks rescued from monotony and inferiority of
status. In any well-organized group every member is

there *because he makes a necessary contribution.* If he does not know that and feel it personally, it is usually a fault of the leader.

In the third case there is the leader who gets an idea and is determined to win support for it. A man may, for example, believe that labor legislation should be forwarded by a national organization, or that old age be provided for, or that branch banking be promoted, or that public ownership be sponsored. Here, of course, the purpose is definite and the determination, ingenuity and wisdom of the leader are crucial. The leader's problem becomes one of education and persuasion. He is successful if enough others can be brought to agree with him and work with him in the desired direction.

In short, every leader must be able fully to satisfy both himself and his group that he has an adequate answer to such queries as the following, which he should periodically put to himself:

Do I know definitely what I want or what the group wants and expects of me in purpose and direction?

Are these purposes defensible socially? And are they likely to be acceptable to the group if it fully understands them?

Can the purposes be broadened and made more inclusive so that the benefits to be secured from following them will be unmistakably seen and felt by the followers to contribute to their own genuine good?

Is the effort of the organization to attain its purposes producing experiences and results which *give to the followers tangible evidence* of the soundness of the aims?

Can the purposes be set forth, be dramatized, be symbolized and kept in view for the followers in simple, appealing ways?

These may prove to be disturbing questions. As already stated, there are today plenty of organized

group efforts in which the followers do not participate on the understanding basis which is ideally desirable. This is often as true in educational, religious and political groups as it is in business where employees take any job they can get. And the leader who does not come to grips with the problem of purposes and his followers' relation to them is simply no leader, for he has evaded the pivotal issue.

Get right with your purposes —as the followers are going to view them—is one of the first commandments for the leader.

ENTHUSIASM

The mere presence of a sound purpose is obviously not enough. It must be *felt* to be sound by all. In other words it must be surcharged with a dynamic emotion, with a hopefulness, with a will to win and an abounding, robust sense of joy in the job. It is something like this which is meant by enthusiasm. And this too is an essential attribute. It is important because it is self-sustaining, and also because it is contagious. Beyond a limited point it cannot be faked. Its genuineness is quickly sensed.

Where the leader has real vigor on the physical side and definiteness of objective on the mental side, enthusiasm is the normal offspring. This does not mean that enthusiasm cannot be deliberately increased. It means that its creation is a derived fact and that out from the springs of great energy and of deep intellectual conviction will pour that emotional exhilaration which is essential for arousing others.

Those who approach the study of leadership solely through the medium of the printed page and without much experience in directing others, will tend to think of leading too intellectually—too much as something

to acquire with the mind, too little as something to *be*. This would be a grave mistake. It is, of course, a dual problem of doing and being.

But if there is one thing that a study of significant leaders reveals, it is that *out of the heart are the issues of leadership.* The obligation of straight thinking by the leader is surely not being slighted in this volume. But the truth remains that the good leader feels deeply, is emotionally primed and has a power to summon and elevate the desire of others which wholly transcends the rational level. Good leaders *are* enthusiasts. They are in their measure possessed, caught up, instruments of a cause or power which uses them. They feel themselves commanded by a power and strength which they in turn command. It is perhaps not without significance that the word, enthusiasm, originally came from Greek words which meant possessed and inspired by some divinity!

Let anyone who thinks he wants to be a leader of any but the most modest proportions look within his own soul and ask himself:

Am I so fully charged with a sense of the importance of a purpose to be realized that I am conscious of being carried forward and dominated by some power working through me and out from me?

Am I so confident, so determined, so mobilized in my whole personality, that my leadership effort has its own way, and in action and human contact gives off light and heat in ways that draw others to it?

If the honest answer to such self-searching questions is "No," then one must look again at the sources of one's energies and the vitality of one's purposes to be sure that the necessary pre-conditions of enthusiasm and power are there. If candid self-examination discloses that, as individuals we do not care enough about any

purposes to sacrifice for them, or are not in that fine responsive condition of fitness which invites energy into the arena of struggle to attain a worthy purpose, then the primary conditions for leading are absent. One may have the outward insignia but the inner secret of power is still hidden.

The good leader is not ashamed of the fact that he is an enthusiast. He knows intuitively that he has to be one. His zeal is in large part the measure in his influence.

Ultimately, such impelling enthusiasm is related also to the basic life faith or outlook which one holds. The pessimist, the cynic or the nihilist is no enthusiast. In a later chapter something more will be said about the deeper spiritual resources upon which the leader should be able to draw to sustain him in holding enthusiastically to his aims.

FRIENDLINESS AND AFFECTION

Several years ago a college president of liberal outlook had a serious difference with his board of trustees as a result of which his resignation was accepted. As an educational leader of some note and compelling power he had gathered about him over a period of years a devoted minority of the faculty members who were men of unusual caliber and who had stayed on with him in the institution despite attractive offers to go elsewhere. Their loyalty to him was at once deeply personal and finely disinterested because of his educational ideals. In a final private meeting with them he said among other things, "Your support has meant everything to me. I brought each of you here because of certain talents, personal and intellectual, which seemed congenial to me and to our common enterprise. I have never worked with a group of men so loyal, to whom I felt so closely bound not merely by professional but by

personal ties of affection and regard. I lay down this responsibility with reluctance but with deep satisfaction in the privilege of working with and for you and of feeling your warm personal support."

A prolonged silence followed his moving declaration. Each man knew the depth of the president's feeling and personal affection for him; each man reciprocated it. There seemed nothing to say. They all got up, shook hands one by one with their leader and without a word left the room, too full of emotion to trust their tongues. Subsequently that distinguished band of scholars scattered to other fields of usefulness. But while this president's leadership was being exercised, it well exemplified a fine relation of personal affection and loyalty mobilized for a lofty end. The emotional warmth of the president's personal relation to his faculty was a crucial element in his success.

Occasionally one meets this type of deep, friendly relations in the so-called "family company" which is now being more and more merged into large corporate aggregates. For instance, there was Mr. Brown, the owner of a small metal-working plant in a town of only a few thousand souls. It was literally true that everyone in that town had a sense of personal devotion to him. His relations with his workers were literally those of a large family. Not only did he know every man by name but he knew all their families and kept in direct personal contact with them. He himself visited the sick; he gave each worker a generous Christmas present; he paid the tuitions of promising children away at school; he pensioned superannuated employees; he conferred frequently and directly with employee groups on all relevant matters of policy.

No doubt there were elements of the patriarchal in Mr. Brown's communal friendliness. But no question

of serious exploitation arose. The company had been fortunate in its capacity to make money, and the profits were generously used, not as bribes or sops but as direct expressions of good will both to workers and to the community. Nor will Mr. Brown die a wealthy man, as wealth goes today. He has tried to use his wealth in ways which are less paternalistic than self-developmental for all those whose lives he touches. He is, as the phrase goes, "worshipped" and venerated by all in that community. And the fruits of that outgoing affection have been a kind of local felicity which is rarely met today.

It is true that the particular pattern of this kind of friendliness is less possible in a day when many organizations have become so enormous. But is it not possible by deliberate effort to translate friendliness into new terms, to pour it into fresh molds, where under present conditions it can still be shown in sincere and telling ways?

It is easy to be sentimental and rhetorical about the part which friendliness and affection play in the task of leadership. But it is hard to convey by mere written utterance how true it is that the good leader feels deeply and affectionately for those he leads.

Capacity for affection differs greatly from person to person. There are those vigorous, lusty, friendly individuals with an outreaching spirit who inevitably attract people. They have a "winning way"; they are "good mixers." There is a certain big-hearted sweep and force to their personalities which invite friendliness and confidence. There is a warmth and directness and sympathetic understanding which quickly creates a rapport with others. Such persons can without difficulty be articulate in their affections.

How much this outward evidence of a warm-hearted personality can be cultivated, it is not easy to say. Also

it must be admitted that there are plenty of instances of successful leaders who do not possess this ready sociability and kindliness—at least in its superficial manifestations. Many splendid leaders with the handicap of great personal shyness are yet able to infuse the active evidences of true fraternal feeling into their organizations and win the response of the followers. The friendliness of such persons is known by its fruits.

Indeed, it is this deeper attitude, irrespective of that desirable magnetic glamor of evident warmth in personal contact, which is the fact of real significance. It is here that the intrinsic reality of friendliness is found. It may be discovered more slowly and it may be less dramatic. But in the long run this attitude under *enlightened direction* permeates the atmosphere of the whole group.

The sources of individual power and personal influence, it should be repeated, are not in the first instance in the head but in the heart. "Out of the heart are the issues of life." The power of the person is the *passion* of the person. It is the *passion* for truth which marks the important philosopher or teacher. It is the *passion* for righteousness which makes the great moral leader. It is the *passion* for justice which distinguishes the leader among jurists. And in industry it is not the passion for profits but for *people* which distinguishes the leader from the mere executive. Nor is it without significance in this connection that passion means in its original sense, capacity to suffer and endure.

The same truth holds good for lesser leaders, in lesser degree. The leader is known by the affection he manifests. And the evidence of this, of course, lies not in what he says but in *what he does*.

One should be quite clear as to what affection is and why it is so potent a force. It is here taken to mean a

state of sympathetic warmth of feeling, friendliness of attitude and conscious solicitude for the well-being and happiness of others. It is an attitude which gives sensitiveness to one's awareness as to the desires of others and the good of others, and creates an eagerness to help realize these.

The one who loves is incited by it to greater efforts to divine the wishes and aspirations of those loved and to behavior which is at once considerate and discerning. Affection heightens sympathetic insight—or at least the effort in that direction.

Affection is therefore essential for the leader because *it predisposes people toward being influenced.* On the whole, individuals prefer to do and be what they believe those who care for them want them to do and be. They then have something to live up to. They have at last a definite idea as to what is expected of them by someone who cares. And it brings them happiness to try to fulfill those expectations and to have the sense of communion which that brings. People thus get a sense that they are needed—and everyone wants the support of feeling themselves necessary to someone or to some cause.

In short, *the friendly attitude is the influencing attitude.* And affection is a positive motivating force over the conduct of those upon whom it is poured out.

Moreover, it usually works in more than one direction. In most normal people an evidence of affection toward them does not usually remain unrequited and unreciprocated. The tendency is for affection to evoke an affectionate response. The parent's affection for the child or the lover's for his beloved may seem often to be rooted in feelings of self-enlargement and self-satisfaction. Yet the parent's feeling is enriched and made complete when and as the child gives back affection in return. And the lover's ardent desire tends to mature

into the most durable affection when it is actively reciprocated by the one he loves.

The leader probably should not expect affection. Yet he finds that he often has it gladly lavished upon him when he himself has been able to give expression to his own outgoing feeling. In general, people's emotional life is so organized that they yearn to feel that someone has regard for them, and they are happy in the chance for an outpouring of their own emotional response.

We often fail to realize that ordinary human lives tend to be emotionally impoverished. Most people are all too seldom exhilarated, animated and stirred by deep feelings of affection. Timid and fearful of rebuff, misunderstanding and indifference, we all stay withdrawn in ourselves far more than we are even conscious of. We are hesitant about letting ourselves go—about committing ourselves to aims and to persons who may have an appeal which might disturb us, and might arouse us into acknowledging desires that we are really eager to realize.

Most of us are a little afraid of our own emotional natures. We mistrust them; we hold them in leash. We are on our guard against seeming too emotionally robust and outgiving of affection. In consequence many individuals much of the time are unconsciously craving to be stirred, summoned and emotionally caught up in an overwhelming, commanding way. They crave something worth-while to give their loyalty to.

Affection for a leader is thus waiting to be shown. The leader, especially in a large and significant project, has the opportunity no less than the privilege of summoning people's friendliness and desire to be affectionate. He calls out feelings people are glad to have good reason to express.

The danger is, once, the leader by affection has brought out devotion, that he will not direct it wisely. Its value, admittedly, is not absolute. It can be manifested on behalf of ends which are wise or stupid; and it can be evidenced in ways which are either helpful or harmful to those loved. No favorable evaluation should forget the qualification that unless intelligently directed, affection can degenerate into soft-heartedness, sentimental ineffectuality or mere personal attachment on the part of the leader and something approaching an uncritical idolatry on the part of the led.

How, then, does the leader's affection become aroused in a deep and vital way?

In the first place it is a highly personalized fact and experience. Affection arises in proportion as a personal friendly interest can be focused. And such an interest arises primarily out of personal acquaintance. "I refuse to meet that man," said an English statesman of one of his opponents, "because if I did I might come to like him."

People find those for whom their regard naturally develops among those they know; and generally they select as close friends those with recognized similarities of interests, tastes and aims. Love of mankind or of a nation is not readily attained. It is a mature and adult growth which has to start from beginnings in local interests. As interests broaden, as aims become by education more general, as the ability to picture individuals imaginatively develops, devotion to larger groups becomes a fact. But without this effort affection stays at home—close to familiar ties and occupations.

It is easy to lead a group of neighbors to agitate for a local playground for their children. It is harder to interest people to try to stop child labor in other

states. It is a real job to lead people to give money for starving Chinese.

The difficulty which a leader faces in fulfilling this prescription of personal acquaintance and contact in a large organization is a real one, which has to be deliberately worked at. Yet much can be done by relatively simple means, if its importance is recognized and *the will to do it* is present.

The first requirement is a deliberate effort—where this does not come spontaneously—to take a friendly interest in followers as individual persons, to know their names and something of their personal concerns and aspirations.

Many leaders not naturally outreaching in their personal relations have found it useful as a beginning to cultivate a systematic *habit* of friendliness and cordiality. They start in on the elevator man with an attentive "good morning," which they also extend to others with whom there is a personal contact. They make the rounds of executive colleagues for an occasional personal chat. They encourage office calls from all in the organization at announced hours. Many executive leaders find that often their most valuable contacts come at the end of the day when work pressure is reduced and associates are just sitting around in informal conversation.

Such a habit of awareness as to the unique interests of individuals will unquestionably develop a helpful antidote to the tacit attitude that people are dull and dumb—an attitude fatal to the birth of any warmth or affection. Such an attentiveness can help to replace the leader's appearance of preoccupation. It lessens his tendency to regard others as pawns in his game.

In short, a habit of friendliness and solicitude for the personal concerns of others helps to give the leader something definite to do as he tries to widen and deepen

his feeling of human interest. Everyone has noted
instances like that of the executive leader who will buy
ice cream for his office staff on a hot afternoon and
send them home at four o'clock to escape the heat, but
who never gives a thought to the workers in his foundry
or other work places where the processes of manufacture
join with the weather to create a temperature of 115°
in the shade. Such regard for the seen followers to the
neglect of those who are out of sight is common. It
reveals an inadequate and an untrained imagination as
to the proper range of a good leader's friendly concern.
Once mindful of the importance of projecting his
concern outward to his unseen followers, the leader
can make this an integral part of his technique.

Further, he may to good advantage make it a
deliberate practice also to know personally a *representa-
tive sampling* of individuals throughout the various
departmental units of his group, if it is a large one. He
can do this with over a hundred individuals without
strain on his time and energy. And if these people are
well distributed, he can thus build up a basis for first-
hand knowledge of representative conditions and
attitudes, which can be of great value to him.

Such an effort, regularly made, would have the
by-product value that the leader as he moved about
would be seen and identified as such by many in the
organization. Thus he gradually ceases to be merely
"the big boss" or "the chief"—anonymous, aloof and
mysterious. He becomes Mr. Smith or Mr. Brown who,
if he is worth his salt, is pointed out with pride and a
sense of personal acquaintance as the directive power
of the organization.

In short, if affection is to grow on either side, the
leader must cease to be a myth and become flesh and
blood—an individual who has his being in personal

relations with his followers. Only such an actualizing of personal presence and contact can best dramatize and humanize the leader.

In the second place, help in the direction of fostering a friendly relation can be found in the leader's wise use of *consciously organized formal contacts with representatives* of the entire personnel of the organization. The comment of a personnel executive comes to mind regarding corporation presidents with whom he had been associated on committees in Washington during the several months when the codes were being drawn under the National Industrial Recovery Act. When the details regarding terms and conditions of employment were under discussion, he said that "the only presidents who showed any clear sense of the situation and had really constructive knowledge to draw upon were those from companies which have collective bargaining or employee-representation plans. These men had come into close personal contact with their workers and were able to talk with first-hand information about the matters at issue."

A sound observation to this same effect was made in the report of the Second Industrial Conference called by President Wilson in 1920:

> The guiding thought of the Conference had been that the right relationship between employer and employee can be best promoted by the deliberate organization of that relationship. That organization should begin within the plant itself. Its object should be to organize unity of interest and thus to diminish the area of conflict, and supply by organized cooperation between employers and employees the advantages of that human relationship that existed between them when industries were smaller. Such organization should provide for the joint action of managers and employees in dealing with their common interests. It should emphasize the responsibility of managers to know men at least as inti-

mately as they know materials, and the right and duty of
employees to have a knowlEdge of the industry, its processes
and policies. Employees need to understand their relation to
the joint endeavor, so that they may once more have a
creative interest in their work.

Industrial problems vary not only with each industry but
in each establishment. Therefore, the strategic place to begin
battle with misunderstanding is within the industrial plant
itself. Primarily the settlement must come from the bottom,
not from the top.

Evidences of this kind could be multiplied by the
score. It has proved true, for instance, in industries
where labor unions have been strong and active, that
years of close, personal, working association of employ-
ers with union leaders has usually built up a sense of
mutual confidence and respect which employers in
non-unionized industries simply cannot understand.

In other words, the existence of certain organized
forms of group association has made it possible for
executive leaders to develop a kind of first-hand feeling
and regard for the attitude and desires of workers, which
they are seemingly unable to obtain in any other way.
Such contact gradually transforms a slight bond into a
profound feeling of friendliness on the leader's part.
And it can make possible a genuinely friendly response
from the led which comes back to reenforce the leader's
own sentiment.

Affection starts with personal acquaintance. It is
furthered by a determined habit of personal solicitude.
It deepens as personal contact continues and begins
to be reciprocated, and it widens as the leader has
imagination to see out beyond his relationship with
the seen to the unseen members.

In summary, the leader who is afraid to give affection
is really afraid to lead in the true sense. Leadership
means a mobilizing of emotional power and passion. But

this is only translated into the most effective relation with the led when they experience this passion in the leader's practical solicitude for them.

His affection is the mark of his realization both that they with him are the agents of fulfilling a significant purpose, and that he without them and their devotion would be impotent to bring something worth-while to fulfillment.

INTEGRITY

People must be able to trust their leaders. They want to feel that their interests are safe in the leader's hands —that he will not betray them, or sell out, or get tired of serving them. They want to be confident that he is not going to offend them or their sense of the fitness of things by conduct unbecoming to the position he holds or inconsistent with the esteem in which he is held. They want to feel a sense of solidity, of honesty, of reliability. "We can trust him" and "he keeps his promises" are tributes he must have earned.

In short, they want the leader to possess integrity.

What kind of behavior and opinions this requirement calls for in the leader will depend, of course, upon the special factors of each individual case. What may be required as integrity in a clergyman is not necessarily what is demanded of a political officeholder, an adult education group leader or a professional baseball captain. It is not a matter of being a paragon of virtue. It is rather a matter of being and acting appropriately to the expectations of the particular constituency.

In general this implies a reasonable harmony and consistency of the motives which are evidenced in the leader's public and private affairs. It means that the individual has himself under control and is reasonably

integrated in character and conduct; that he is not torn
with inner conflicts and divided in his mind and inten-
tions by opposed interests and loyalties.

A problem sometimes arises for the leader in this
connection, which is too familiar to be ignored. It takes
the form of a question as to how far his responsibility
in one field of leadership requires that he be regular,
conventional and conformist throughout the pattern
of his whole behavior. The leader in one particular field
may well find his ideas at variance with those of his
followers in such other and unrelated matters as his
political views, economic beliefs, religious convictions
or ideas about sex relations.

On the whole the leader cannot wisely be too far
in advance of or at variance with the general views of his
group, if he wants to stay in power. Obviously people
do not want complete conformity in the leader at
every point. If we had this we would have no leader.
But his divergence of views and actions must not be too
extreme. It must seem to grow as a natural development
of his known traits, as a plausible next-step progression
beyond the beliefs of the group members. It must seem
to be a condition which conceivably they *might* attain,
were they more sure of its soundness.

Definitely, of course, he cannot offend in any blatant
way against the standards of taste or morals of his
followers and still expect loyalty. There are, un-
doubtedly, instances of leaders who did offend against
the canons of taste of their followers and still appear
not to have lost their support. Yet even where such
offenses seem to be condoned and forgiven, they do
disturb and permanently lessen the trust which the
leader formerly enjoyed. On the other hand, there are
certainly plenty of cases of otherwise effective leaders
who have lost their positions because of ideas or conduct

not thought to be appropriate to their prestige and status.

It is true that people want results from their leaders first and foremost. But in the long run they do not want them at the expense of shocking their sense of what is fitting and decent. They want to be able to admire the leader as a complete, self-consistent personality. Minor oddities of dress, manner, speech and the like may be condoned or even admired as marks of distinction, but major offenses against morals or taste are resented to such a degree that influence is lost.

Where, however, the divergence of views relates to the major objective of the leader and he believes profoundly that he is right and his followers are wrong, the demand upon him to maintain his own integrity is unqualified. In such cases there are only two alternatives. He tries to convince the followers that he is right about the worth of the aim in view or the ways of achieving it. If after a reasonable time he fails in this, his own integrity requires that he resign—making clear to the group the grounds on which he has acted.

But these are exceptional instances. Typically, the leader must be willing, as a condition of holding his position, to be mindful of his followers' feelings, even in those parts of his life which are dissociated from the project in which he is leading. And if he has affection for his followers, it will be all the easier for him to do nothing which will destroy their sense of his integrity.

Integrity is demanded, moreover, for another quite different reason. In a complex society there are conflicting demands upon the time of people and upon the amount of attention each can devote to the several groups to which he belongs. It becomes a physical impossibility to have a competent opinion about many issues upon which, as voters, executives, parents,

consumers, investors, philanthropists, etc., each of us is called to express himself. Yet our opinion is sought, our vote is expected or our proxy is asked by a dozen groups with which we are affiliated.

In this situation, people are under the necessity of putting great trust in a variety of leaders. Whether we want to or not, we have to. This requires that people shall be able to repose personal confidence in those who are leading in diverse fields. Nor can they do this with satisfaction to themselves if the leader is not a person upon whose integrity they can count. Obviously this trust can be carried too far. But it is a necessary process —once the integrity of the leader is demonstrated.

Integrity originally means wholeness. The leader who can attain within himself a unity or wholeness of drive and outlook will possess integrity. The acquiring of this quality is thus no little thing, and the process requires no minor adjustment. It is a major problem of the whole life philosophy and character of the individual. It is a question of the leader's capacity to be loyal to the basic demand for loyalty itself.

THE LEADER AS EXECUTIVE

MANY leaders are in the first instance executives whose primary duty is to direct some enterprise or one of its departments or sub-units.

Naturally they must first be able to do the executive job—or see that it is done. It is therefore necessary to consider in further detail which particular phases of executive work dovetail closely into the effort to lead and best contribute to it.

Questions arise, for example, about the extent to which the leader should have technical mastery, about his role as a maker of decisions, and, more generally, as to the power of intellectual and imaginative grasp which he can bring to his labors.

TECHNICAL MASTERY

In every organization or group there are many definite, particular activities to be carried through. The normal need for subdividing and functionalizing duties often proceeds to a point where the coordinating executive at the top cannot possibly pretend to a working knowledge of more than a fraction of the details. Even within staff departments and among department heads a multiplicity of minor tasks may remove the possibility of inclusive technical mastery by the titular head.

This is the condition faced in corporations, institutions, governmental departments and the like. And

as the size of the organization increases the need for specific technical command seems to decrease as the higher ranges of executive leadership are reached.

Another situation is met, however, where the leader is a teacher before a class, or a group conference head or a minister with his congregation. In such cases the required technical command of pedagogical skill, conference techniques or homiletic ability should be a constantly present and influential part of the leader's equipment. Here technical skill is directly a part of skill in leading.

It remains true that in every leadership situation the leader has to possess enough grasp of the ways and means, the technology and processes by means of which the purposes are being realized, to give wise guidance to the directive effort *as a whole*.

In business the traditional—and often ineffectual— way of meeting this need for technical grasp by the leader has been to elevate successful department heads into positions of top leadership. A factory superintendent, a sales manager or a controller is frequently promoted to be general manager. And experience is general that such a department head tends to carry into his new general administrative post too much of the point of view of his earlier experience. He tends also to ignore the efforts at leading which facilitate the *human* interrelations among staff and line heads and with the rank and file.

It is for these reasons that a new recognition is gaining headway that the job of leading has its own special techniques, and that these are different in kind from the special techniques of directing or operating line or staff departments. Wherever it is found with the increasing size of an organization that the top executive posts require primarily a *coordinative*

responsibility, there the leadership aspect comes at once to the fore as of major importance.

A department store, a large bank, a railroad or an industrial corporation of more than a few hundred people—all these demand at the top a quality of coordinative skill which makes the attributes of a leader essential. And it is unquestionably one of the weaknesses of education in business and institutional administration that it is so little directed toward preparing the best qualified men to become all-round leaders, who will be able to see an enterprise *as a whole* and to coordinate the specialized efforts of various executives of major line and staff units.

The same need is increasingly being felt in governmental departments and bureaus. Such bodies are often composed of technically trained experts. Yet at their head should be a general coordinating executive leader who is more than a good technician. Where in the present scheme of training for the public service are such leaders to be found?

Training in our engineering colleges is also being recognized as deficient at this point. Recent studies have shown that a majority of graduates of highly specialized engineering courses eventually become general executives. "The evidence," say Wickenden and Smith,[1] "presents a rather clear picture of the problem before engineering schools: A predominantly executive profession both in the occupations of its members and in its rewards; a training that with all its merits has been least effective in developing the qualities of leadership which underlie executive success; and a growing body of opinion that executive traits can be developed by training."

The leading of an orchestra has long embodied an acknowledgment of the truth that the technique of

total leadership is something different from the techniques with particular instruments. The orchestra conductor may be extremely versatile as a performer of individual instruments. But to become a conductor he takes a special course in conducting and trains deliberately for the task of coordination. Nothing less than this demand, it would seem, should be made in qualifying for top executive leadership in many kinds of large organizations. They require preeminently an ability to use coordinative and leadership techniques.

Briefly, the coordinative technique means ability to help formulate, transmit, interpret and supervise the working out of policies with *people*—with the members of the group from top to bottom.[2]

Some of the techniques of record-keeping, analysis of results and the like, may differ greatly from one organization to another. But other elements will be common in many leadership positions. Problems as to who is to participate in policy formulation, what organized conference methods may be best for this purpose, how those who do not participate may best be informed and persuaded of the need for proposed new policies, delegation of responsibility and authority for doing specific parts of the work required to carry out a policy—these must be handled by the leader as integral parts of his special coordinating technique. And these are as much aspects of the leadership function as they are parts of the coordinative job, because they involve influencing people.

In general the principle underlying success at the coordinative task has been found to be that *every special and different point of view in the group affected by major executive decisions should be fully represented by its own exponents when decisions are being reached.* These special points of view are inevitably created by

the differing outlooks which different jobs or functions inevitably foster.

The more the leader can know at first hand about the technique employed by all in his group, the wiser will be his grasp of all his problems. His knowledge of the time factors involved in the work being done is, for example, helped by this. "How long should I expect this or that task to take?" is an important question for the leader to be able to answer. There is always danger that his sense of the pace at which tasks can be accomplished will be wrong and that he will be led either to ask the impossible or not to demand enough.

Also, the effectiveness with which the purpose is being realized, may often be conditioned by the leader's technical grasp. He must at all times be able to answer the question "Are we getting our job done effectively?" And this means he should be familiar with standards of sound performance and related matters of technical import.

In this connection, it is important for the leader in many cases to know how to make use of technical experts. He should be able to select experts shrewdly, to stimulate them to their best work and to use their findings judiciously without being overborne by them. The expert, it has been wisely said, should be on tap and not on top. And the good leader can greatly extend his area of effective work if he learns how to draw on experts while still keeping technical opinions in subordination to his own more inclusive and therefore truer perspective of what he and his group are trying to do.

Every potential leader will therefore do well to ask himself, "Do I know enough of the technique of this enterprise to gain the confidence of my followers and to realize our common purposes?"

"Do I know how to bring my followers into conference and council with me in ways to facilitate (1) the broadening of purposes when that is necessary and (2) the adoption of policies and plans of action which will achieve them surely and satisfactorily to all. In short, am I a good coordinator?"

"Do I understand the relation of the parts to the whole in the organization, so that I am not afraid of experts but am able to use them to make my own grasp more thorough?"

There is undoubtedly a fine respect which is accorded to the man who *knows*. Workers are always impressed when the department head can step up to a job and say to the worker, "Let me show you; it doesn't go that way; *this* is the way it's done"; and who then does it with skill and finish.

But more and more the key to leadership lies in other directions. It lies in ability to make a team out of a group of individual workers, to foster a team spirit, to bring their efforts together into a unified total result, to make them see the significance of the particular task each one is doing in relation to the whole.

It is in this broader sense that the real skill of leaders is being increasingly viewed. Where their past experience and training have been such that leaders can add to that skill proficiency at individual jobs in the organization, that is so much to the good. But it is not the determining factor. The task of leading is essentially and functionally different from the tasks requiring other specialized skills.

DECISIVENESS

Ultimately the leader has to get results. There must be action and accomplishment. The group objective must be measurably realized. This is vital. To cut

across indecision with decision, to galvanize indifference into enthusiastic performance, to translate doubt of possibilities into the swing of going actuality—to effect these transitions is the leader's peculiar prerogative and duty. "He did the job" is the tribute from which leadership cannot escape.

How he did it, what motives he summoned and what residuum of achieved satisfaction he has left with his followers—these too are intrinsic aspects of his success. But leadership is at a premium because so many people are loath to make irrevocable decisions, are tepid in their enthusiasms, timid in their faith in themselves and others, afraid of the burden of responsibility and undecided about their direction.

Emphasis on decisiveness is important because of the danger that the studiously and "scientifically" minded who are in posts of leadership will never stop taking evidence and accumulating and weighing facts. Lincoln Steffens in his "Autobiography"[3] has an instructive and sound comment on this point. He quotes a conversation with Woodrow Wilson while the late President was in France, in which President Wilson said:

> An executive is a man of action. An intellectual—such as you and I [he smiled] an intellectual is inexecutive. In an executive job we are dangerous, unless we are aware of our limitations and take measures to stop our everlasting disposition to think, to listen, to—not act. I made up my mind long ago, when I got into my first executive job, to open my mind for a while, hear everybody who came to me with advice, information—what you will—then, some day, the day when mind felt like deciding, to shut it up and act. My decision might be right; it might be wrong. No matter, I would take a chance and do—something.

In a word, the demand is that the leader should take human experience in hand and resolutely make it

eventuate in the direction he believes it should take. Dangers of his arbitrariness, of stubbornness, of too great rigidity of method there will be—real dangers to be guarded against. But the world waits, when it places individuals in positions of headship, upon their readiness to *act*—forcefully, vigorously, effectively, and rightly if possible—but to act so that the rest of us may with a certain relief throw off the incubus of vacillation and act too.

At its best, the process of deciding is, psychologically, one of weighing evidence, picturing alternate eventualities and making a choice by which one is willing to stand. Soundness of judgment and courage in facing the outcome are two important conditions here.

Ability to exercise judgment soundly can be developed. The elements to master here are the known elements of the reasoning process. If these are carefully followed, the resulting judgments are sure to be better than if no conscious attempt at reasoning is made. It will be necessary, therefore, to state briefly what the elements or steps in the process of reasoning are.

First, there is the *recognition* of the problem to be faced. Second, there is required an adequate *accumulation* of facts, of all possible data relevant to the problem at issue. The more complete the facts, the more likely is a sound answer to emerge.

When the evidence is all in, the third step is its *classification* and *arrangement* into related groupings which should help to throw some light on a tentative answer. The fourth step is the *formulation of an hypothesis* or trial solution—one which in the light of the facts seems a likely answer.

The fifth step is the *corroboration* of this hypothetical answer to see if it holds water, commends itself to good

sense, seems reasonable or, best of all, proves to work effectively in action. Admittedly in human affairs, as, for example, in regard to many proposed reforms, this testing process may be a long one and it may be difficult or impossible to get sound appraisal of results in advance. Sometimes it is possible to establish a testing on a small scale which can be extended if results look promising.

The sixth step is the *adoption* or acceptance of the hypothesis or trial solution as valid and useful, as long as the facts of the whole situation remain substantially the same and the results of applying the solution continue satisfactory.

This is the process often spoken of as inductive thinking or as the use of the scientific method in thinking. Judgments or choices made as a result of a careful following of these steps will be far sounder than the results of random selection. One great difficulty is that it is so often impossible to know all the qualifying facts. And in human situations and problems we forget that what other people think and feel about the points at issue is just as important a fact as that their opinion may be wrong, no matter how they reached their conclusion.

The application of the process of rational deliberation to the solving of a specific question may present difficulties; but that does not lessen the value of this process in arriving at sound judgments.

Decisiveness is sometimes thought of as a peremptory quality of rapid and perhaps intuitive character. One certainly sees leaders who mistakenly think and act as if decisions must be quickly made in order to be impressive. Yet the appearance of rapidity is often deceptive. The leader by his complete immersion in the facts of his situation is frequently able to give a wise

decision with what seems like great speed. But what appears to be an intuitive flash is often the result of deep prior reflection, or of an incubation of ideas which has been going on for some time. Or it may be that a quick decision is easy because similar issues have been satisfactorily met before.

It is important also to call attention to the manner and appearance with which the act of deciding is invested. The leader must not only be decisive; he must impress his followers with the fact that a decision has been reached and that hesitation, vacillation and questioning are over. He must *act* in a decided way and support his decision with a confident and courageous attitude. He must *look* decided.

Nothing so betrays the leader as reluctance to stand behind, defend and pay the price of the course of action he has chosen to follow. He must be willing squarely to shoulder the responsibility; and it is at this point that many people reveal deficiencies which debar them from real strength as leaders.

Again and again in factories, workers at the bench have refused to take a foreman's post because they did not want the responsibility and anxiety which it entailed. No one has made the attempt to stimulate their imaginations as to the opportunities and satisfactions which as leaders they might attain. To some extent they are right. Leading is hard work. Leading means bearing the brunt of responsibility; it means being forever focused seriously on the purpose in hand. It often means assuming burdens which others have proved too ineffectual to carry. And always, of course, it means trying to influence others so that they want to take their own share of responsibility and enjoy their part of the load.

Those who are going to lead should also be prepared in advance to realize that they cannot be right all the time. Only the man who never does anything, as Theodore Roosevelt used to say, never makes a mistake. Many leaders spend valuable time trying to save their faces over errors of judgment when a candid admission of error and a fresh start would be preferable to their followers. They hold to the view that a change of mind, a shift of plans, an altering of objectives is a sign of weakness. Nothing could be more mistaken. One proper aspect of decisiveness is to know when a wrong decision has been reached and to decide to change. How that new decision is to be conveyed to followers is a point to be carefully thought through in each particular situation. But done in the right way it does not lessen the con- fidence of the led, but reenforces their respect for the honesty, integrity and insight of the leader.

It is unfortunately still thought to be bad form for a political leader to change his mind on large issues of policy. Yet such changes have constantly to be made. And if followers are to follow happily and effectively, it would seem the wiser course to be candid and explicit about what the changes are and why they have oc- curred. This lingering notion that decisiveness implies inflexibility or infallibility is a hang-over from the days when the autocrat was considered the best leader.

One of the refreshing signs of a new political temper in this connection is the frank way in which President Roosevelt has consistently announced that his recovery program had large elements of *experimentation* in it, and that if one method did not succeed others would be tried. No batter, he reminded us, expects to make a hit every time he comes to bat. By this insistence on an experimental approach, he has made it easier for

decisions to be changed without the appearance of indecisiveness and without the need for elaborate argument that some new policy is consistent with one already tried and decided against—however inconsistent it may actually be.

The capacity and the willingness to make decisions can be cultivated. With some people indecisiveness has become a vicious habit. But the opposite trait can by deliberate intention be built into a helpful habit.

Start the habit of deciding by making up your mind promptly on small things. Acquire the habit of selecting your choices firmly and then dropping all other possible alternatives from your mind. Such action need not be arbitrary or capricious. Judgment can be exercised; alternatives should be critically reviewed. But action is necessary! The wise leader can learn to decide what issues are so important that he must take time and thought to weigh them; but these are relatively few. The world rightly expects leaders to decide and to start performance.

Another way to assure that decision-making will be easier and less often needed, is the prior planning and standardizing of as much of the usual routine of operation as can safely be left to standard practice instructions. For a leader to find himself called upon too frequently for decisions is usually *prima facie* evidence that the ordinary course of operating activities has not been well laid out, that instructions have not been well imparted, that the responsibility for the smooth flow of execution has not been adequately delegated.

All this is no argument for the leader's playing a lone hand. It is not a contradiction of anything already said about the necessity for taking counsel, for using the conference to create or change group purposes, for getting a common mind and desire to develop where

confusion and difference prevailed before. There is a distinction to be observed between methods of getting agreement and the need for being eventually decisive about the fact that there *is* agreement and that the time has come to lead on to execution.

Also, nothing that is said on behalf of decisiveness should be construed as arguing for stubbornness, obstinacy or inflexibility on the leader's part. Some may overplay it in these directions, just as there will be those who, lacking the courage of their decisions, will try to save their faces by placing blame upon colleagues or subordinates if decisions prove wrong.

These misconceptions of the need for decisiveness do not make it less essential. Leaders should appreciate the part that judgment plays, and train themselves to size up situations rapidly by developing the habit of thinking problems through systematically. Thus in a well informed and logical mind decisiveness can work with speed and accuracy.

Finally, the real leader will stand ready courageously to pay the price of seeing his decision through without the disruptive tactics of blaming others for his own errors.

INTELLIGENCE

The factor of intelligence in personality is perhaps more completely innate than most others. As here used, intelligence means capacity to see the point, to sense relationships and analogies quickly, to "put two and two together," to find the salient factors in past experience which are helpful in shedding light on present difficulties. Intelligence is the ability to appraise situations readily, to see their significance in the total setting of present and past experience and to get the cue as to the likely line of wise action.

This capacity differs greatly from person to person. How much it can be developed by conscious effort is still an open question, but the indications are that not a great deal can be done directly. It is a capacity which seems under normal circumstances to remain fairly constant in quality throughout the individual's life.

There is, however, this important qualification. This is an endowment which is seemingly conditioned in a marked way by the kind of environment which the individual has had as a child. If the whole domestic and social setting of a child's life has been such as to challenge his wits, to demand and call out intelligent and alert responses, to stimulate and offer appreciation of his show of good head work—the evidence is unmistakable that his full powers of intelligence will come into evidence. Otherwise they may never be fully summoned and exhibited.

What little scientific evidence there is above the consensus of observable facts seems to point to the truth that, *other qualities being equal*, the person of greater intelligence will probably make the better leader. There is reason to believe that of several candidates for a supervisory position, who seem approximately equal in the other necessary characteristics, the one with the highest intelligence quotient will probably make the best leader.

The few available studies indicate also that this higher intelligence factor in leaders correlates with *versatility*. The tentative conclusion seems to be that those capable of leading in one field are likely to be found potentially high in capacity to lead in several fields. The kind of eager, alert, outreaching mental quality which marks the leader predisposes him to use his powers in several directions.

The necessity of relatively high intelligence in a leader will be readily acknowledged, it would seem, if the demands upon him are considered. In most situations, in his selection of objectives, in his technical mastery of the coordinative process, in his capacity to decide wisely, in his exercise of teaching skill and all the rest—his ability to see the point, appraise experience and get to the heart of problems shrewdly, must be high. And he must show this ability with confidence— without undue delay and without that uncertainty which would cause anguish or distrust among his followers.

Little can be said to the potential leader in a constructive way about the development of this kind of intelligent resourcefulness. But honest self-knowledge as to one's comparative standing in respect to this quality can sometimes prevent one's reach from exceeding one's grasp. He will be a fortunate leader who can gauge his own powers so accurately that he does not let his ambition (or his associates) dictate an elevation to a place and a power which it will be beyond his capacity to exercise.

Yet even at this point qualifications are necessary. There are unquestionably many leaders who have made up in persistence and dogged determination what they lacked in intelligence, or who by integrity and friendliness offset their limitations of mentality.

The general truth still stands, however, that one should not assume a leadership role with which one's intelligence is not able to cope. No leader can rise higher than his mentality will allow. Often successful department heads make poor general executives, and deficiencies of intelligence are frequently the crucial factor.

Honesty with oneself on this point should not be a source of discouragement or a check upon aspiration.

But it should enable one to direct one's talents and supplement one's equipment by the development of those other necessary qualities which do in practice help to make up for deficiencies of mental acumen.

A final reason for emphasizing the value of intelligence is that this question recurs in every organization: How shall we get this done? Sometimes the answer emerges out of group deliberation. But responsibility for applying ideas which will answer all the "how" questions falls ultimately upon the leader. He it is who must take the initiative in finding the right ideas, in facilitating their proper evaluation, in expressing them and finally in putting them across. He does not do all this alone or unaided. But, from whatever source, he must have ideas. These may relate to any aspect of the group's endeavor, to the normal flow of activities or to the handling of crises and emergencies. And he is a poor leader whose ingenuity fails to supply the answer.

No doubt there are many occasions when his own creative talent in the mental realm is not called for. It is often rather qualities of resourcefulness, of a proper time sense as to when conditions are ripe for an idea, of judgment and capacity to select the best idea from among those presented to him, which mark the successful leader. In politics, for example, one could cite scores of examples of good leadership where the ability to use ideas shrewdly is the conspicuous trait, where the gift for a simple phrasing and crystallizing of ideas which are in the air, is the great need.

Within the going operation of corporations or institutions, on the other hand, the demand is for ability to adapt general ideas to specific situations, to know what to suggest when routine practices are disturbed by emergencies, to interpret the organization as a whole to each individual member.

In short, quite irrespective of how he comes by his ideas, the leader at every level has to have intelligence enough to know how to implement the endeavors of this group toward the given aim. He may fall far short of being himself an "idea man." But he must be able to take the ideas of tacticians, strategists, theorists and all kinds of experts and see that from them a proper selection is made, an understandable phrasing of them is set forth, a persuasive interpretation is given them and, finally, that they are put into action by his followers.

Two other correlative qualities deserve mention in this connection, as special evidences of intelligence— namely, *imagination* and a *sense of humor*.

The capacity for imagination can probably be improved by deliberate effort. It may be defined as a mental picturing of a new combination of ideas brought into meaningful and useful relation. The ability to imagine is the ability to create in advance in one's own mind a new plan or line of action which when tried proves practical.[4]

An inventor represents this process at a significant level as applied to new arrangements and devices. The material elements he works with are in a sense all familiar. But he is able to conceive new relationships and combinations of them which result in useful creations. He does this by his knowledge of the properties of the materials used, by his fertile contriving, assembling and testing of new spatial and functional relations among them. He sets himself a definite problem, masters all its known factors, ruminates upon it, lives with it, saturates himself in it. Gradually—or sometimes in a flash—out of this process of incubation, a new thing is pictured in his mind.

In the field of useful ideas about human relations exactly the same elements are present in successful

imagining. One has to identify carefully the problem to be solved. One has to become steeped in all the factual data and their implications. One has to ponder what possible new meanings emerge in the mind as the gestating process goes on. Often one has to leave the problem with all its data to precipitate itself in the mind. That is what "sleeping over" a difficulty implies. One has to be eager, fresh, persistent and completely informed. And then in the fullness of time one may hit upon an answer. One may imagine what should be done; and then be ready to give it verbal expression and eventual trial.

It will be seen that this is really but an elaboration of the process of reasoning. It is a more daring, more independent and untrammeled effort. An executive, for example, may by reasoning decide that his organization should institute a broad training program. But it is in his imagination that he will build up an advance picture of the facilities he is going to provide, the teachers he will secure, the interesting selection of courses which will be offered, the ways the program will be made to stimulate and elevate the personal capacities of his group.

No doubt people differ tremendously in the vigor and the constructive quality of the imagination they possess. Some people seem to dash off valuable new combinations of ideas as abundantly as sparks come off an emery wheel. Leaders who have this advantage are fortunate; yet they are often in danger of being unwilling to follow excellent products of their imaginations through to performance, or of being quite uncritical as to which of their suggestions are practical and which are not.

Then too there are those—less often will they be leaders—who instead of exercising their imaginations

in constructive ways, are content to daydream. They create pleasant fantasies of wish fulfilment quite removed from actuality or possibility. They retire into a dream world of their own creation; and their reveries may well become positively harmful in bringing about an excessive isolation of the individual and a progressive inability to cope with realities.

Imagination is excellent and essential. It is a good servant but a poor master. It behooves a leader who is trying to cultivate and apply his capacity in that direction to seek the restraining influence of others' criticism and to have the check of testing one new proposal before rushing headlong to the next. In organizations where certain executive leaders are recognized as idea-men, they are carefully kept in hand by their associates when it comes to applying what they can so brilliantly evolve.

However, men with lively imaginations can be tremendously useful. And a wise organization, when it identifies leaders who are potentially strong in this quality, will try to encourage their offerings by *giving them time to think* and full access to the necessary data. In general, organizations get far less benefit from the imagination of their leaders than they should. The reason for this is that so great a premium tends to be placed upon a superficial appearance of constant physical activity or of continuous physical presence at a desk.

In this connection it is interesting to note the frequency with which organizations display a certain duality of top leadership—or at least of top executive direction. Often this has come about without conscious intention; and it would be well if more conscious use could be made of this idea so that each of the two heads might see his complementary role in true

perspective and work within his own best area of accomplishment. Organizations both large and small often disclose at the top one strong, imaginative, human-contact executive and one who acts as the brake, who is good at figures, slower to make up his mind, naturally more critical and cautious.

Together two such men make a strong combination. But when the contact man is unchecked he tends to go too fast and too speculatively; and when the cautious man tries to interfere in the human-relations part of the executive program he is likely to stir up needless frictions and misunderstandings among the employees.

Ideally, of course, the leader would contain within himself the best characteristics of each type. Practically, where limitations of temperament and personality narrow the effective field of a man's performance, he is wiser if he works closely in harness and does not let his imagination, his enthusiasm or his temperamental caution run away with him.

It has never been demonstrated that a *sense of humor* can be acquired. But it surely is important as a lubricant—as helping a leader not to take himself too seriously and as making dealings with others more amiable and less tense. Probably most of us believe that our own sense of humor is excellent and adequate! Even so, it is worth while to suggest how and why a sense of humor is valuable to leaders.

Those in a position of influence over others have their special temptations. They may come to feel much too superior, to be too self-willed and insistent, too pompous, too intent and urgent about their mission. It is easy and natural for their points of strength to become so exaggerated that they are betrayed by them.

At this point a sense of humor can be a saving grace and helpful corrective.

For one thing a sense of humor about himself can help the leader to keep the attitude of his followers toward him a friendly one. And to do this he must even be willing on occasion to let them feel superior to him. One canny sales manager in conferences with his salesmen about ways of introducing new products to the retail trade often starts: "You fellows know much more about what's going on than I do. I haven't been on the road for years. But I remember how. . . . " and then he will go on with some anecdote about a bill of goods that he once tried unsuccessfully to sell to a tough customer.

The following incident illustrates President Wilson's recognition of the sound strategy of making the followers feel that momentarily at least they are in a position of relative advantage:[5]

> Shortly after Woodrow Wilson had been elected governor of New Jersey he was introduced at a dinner of the New York Southern Society as a "future President of the United States." For him it was a big moment.
>
> "I find myself," said Wilson after a few opening words, "in one respect (I hope in only one respect) resembling certain persons I heard of in a story that was repeated to me the other day. A friend of mine was in Canada with a fishing party, and one member of the party was imprudent enough to sample some whiskey that was called 'Squirrel' whiskey. It was understood that it was called 'Squirrel' whiskey because it made those who drank it inclined to climb a tree.
>
> "This gentleman imbibed too much of this dangerous liquid, and the consequence was that when he went to the train to go with the rest of the company, he took a train bound south instead of a train bound north.
>
> "Wishing to recover him, his companions telegraphed the conductor of the south-bound train: 'Send short man

named Johnson back for the north-bound train. He is
intoxicated.'

"Presently they got a reply from the conductor. 'Further
particulars needed. There are thirteen men on the train who
don't know either their name or their destination.'

"Now, I am sure that I know my name, but I am not so
sure as your presiding officer that I know my destination."

A sense of humor is found upon analysis to depend
in part on the satisfaction one has in seeing pretentions
of superiority in others deflated. One of the recurring
keynotes of situations which make people laugh centers
around bringing someone back to a reasonable sense
of his self-importance, of restoring to him and to
everyone else a better perspective and a more whole-
some proportion in the view he has of himself. Humor
helps, as we say, to put people in their place in ways
that are not too direct, heavy-handed and conducive
to resentment.

Again, humor helps people retain a sense of propor-
tion about activity and effort. The single-track mind,
too great preoccupation with petty details, insistence
in season and out upon one's big idea—these are
favorite objects of ridicule and laughter. And the
person who can laugh at himself when he recognizes
these weaknesses in himself has his own remedy at
hand.

One of his biographers tells of Napoleon that at
his coronation, seated on the throne with the pope
in front of him, he said in a low aside to his brother,
"Joseph, if only father could see this!" . . . And
"when he wants to whisper something to his uncle,
who stands just in front of him during Mass, he gives
the cardinal a gentle dig in the back with his sceptre."[6]

One reason for a discreet use of humorous anecdote
and funny stories by leaders, whether in public address

or in smaller conferences, is a realization that they ease the strain upon attention and purposive zeal. They help to restore a sense of the normal; they make people realize that the leader shares with his followers a lightness of touch and a generous recognition of the frailties and foibles of mankind. And, finally, in some subtle way as people laugh together they come closer together in a spirit of group unity. Laughter mellows as it unites.

Andrew Carnegie recognized this in his dealings with his workers. His biographer[7] tells how in a widely read article in the *Forum* Carnegie had reiterated the phrase, "Thou shalt not take thy neighbor's job," by way of condemning the practice of hiring "scabs" to put in the places of striking workers. The phrase was taken up and widely quoted.

> Carnegie insisted that any dispute could be settled if employers and employed, in accommodating mood, gathered around the same table and discussed their differences. He had absolute confidence in his own resources in situations of this kind. His ready wit had saved more than one distressful crisis. On a particular occasion, when trouble was threatening in the Edgar Thomson Works, Carnegie went to Braddock, called his workmen together and addressed them in cheerful vein. At the conclusion he invited any hearer to rise and present his grievance. Carnegie's *Forum* article, with its celebrated catch phrase, was in everybody's mind. A workman slowly rose in response to the speaker's suggestion.
> "Now, Mr. Carnegie," he began, "you take my job . . . "
> Quick as a flash Carnegie broke in,
> "Mr. Carnegie takes no man's job!"
> The happy interruption was received with roars of laughter and cheers. It was some moments before the workmen recovered from their hilarious appreciation. Carnegie's joke put everyone in such excellent humor that the tension was removed, and the dispute which, in less skillful hands, would have had deplorable results, was easily adjusted.

Kindly laughter is a, great solvent. It can help immensely to lessen difficult tension in group meetings of all sorts if it can be raised at the psychological moment—and if it is not raised at the expense of any individual participants. Laughing at people may occasionally be justified among intimates. But laughter invoked by a leader has certainly to be kept on a general and impersonal level, touching experiences and situations which are reasonably universal in kind.

There are those few gifted leaders who have at the tip of their tongues an appropriate humorous yarn for any occasion. But for most of us less resourceful persons, it is often a good practice to jot down and make a collection of anecdotes which might prove useful, and then to run through this and cull out a suitable story or two when a forthcoming occasion promises to profit by it. Even so, half the success of such an effort is in the skill of recital. And that is something which comes to most only with conscious practice.

CHAPTER VIII

THE LEADER AS TEACHER

PAUL W. LITCHFIELD was vice-president of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company when one of the young men whom he had selected for advancement proved not to be developing as he had hoped. He therefore decided to have a heart-to-heart talk with him, and the young man, Mr. Slusser, has reported the incident as follows:[1]

"Slusser," he said, "I have let you run pretty loose around here, and as a result you have been in trouble—frequent trouble—with other men. You have had arguments with them. You have fought with the head of nearly every department in the company. This sort of thing must stop."

I tried to explain that I was only pushing things through, and if people got in my way—well, if they did I wasn't going to let them stay there.

He listened until I had finished my explanation, and then his voice snapped:

"Young man, you've done some pretty good work for Goodyear but in doing it you've antagonized every man in the place. Excepting Stephens, you haven't a friend in the company. While this situation exists I will not promote you one step further. I will not because I cannot. You give no consideration to, nor for, the men working with you and under you. Apparently it has never occurred to you that people are human. You've got to change your thinking, so you can show consideration for others. Unless you do, you're through. I'll not promote you further until the men themselves come to me and ask to have you promoted. There's nothing else for you to say, nor for me to say."

I went out of Mr. Litchfield's office with my head up—leastways, I like to think it was up—but with my heart in

my boots, [recalled Slusser]. I began to take stock of myself. I wasn't old and I had come along so fast that I had begun to think that my own way was a good way. It wasn't an easy thing for me to do—to adjust my own thinking to the thinking of other men and to try to appreciate their points of view. I was months fighting myself, schooling myself, to see both sides of a question. It is always a hard job to ask anyone to do—to lick himself. Mr. Litchfield gave me the clue to that extremely valuable lesson in business.

This is a specific instance of the leader acting as teacher—setting up a goal, posing a problem, guiding subsequent activities, holding a person to a new way of mind and conduct.

Testimony of similar import comes about the working methods of Owen D. Young:[2]

From the beginning of his association in 1913 with the staff of the General Electric [says his biographer] Mr. Young's effectiveness was due largely to the qualities which had made him so successful as a teacher; his power of clear analysis of problems, his ability to state them so everybody easily understood his meaning, his personality—a combination of sympathy, firmness, modesty and what men call charm. In short order he became in business one whose opinions and methods interested—invited study. He began to penetrate the entire staff as an educator, not an educator in improved and formalized methods of business administration, but in the art and science of human relations—in the value of intuitions, in taking on responsibility, in the sacredness of obligation and in the necessity of being able to communicate to others what is in your mind.

The good leader, one has to conclude, is a good teacher. His role is like the teacher's in helping followers through experiences which bring a changed mind and motive. Emphasis upon this view of his task would be helpful if for no other reason than that it keeps to the front the complete difference between

leading and bossing. A good teacher is never a boss. He is a guide helping to start and hold the students' interest toward mastery in a particular field. And this is no less true of the leader.

The idea that *good training can largely take the place of order-giving* is gaining constantly greater headway in organizations. But its progress depends, of course, upon the thoroughness with which the work of organizations is carefully planned, scheduled, subdivided, standardized in its details and reduced to specific standard-practice instruction sheets for each job—all of which can form a solid base for the training to build upon.

The progress of the training attitude depends also upon insistence by the executive leaders that a teaching emphasis, a teaching process and a teaching program become dominant. Hence an examination of some of the tested principles of good teaching should offer much help to the leader. These will now be briefly considered.

In the first place, the good teacher tries to build up as immediately as possible a sense in the learner that he is engaged upon an enterprise which is *significant for him* and which he will therefore enjoy. This sense may be imparted to some slight extent by an intellectual appeal, by showing the learner what for him are the value and meaning in what is about to be learned. But more effectively it is conveyed by the teacher's own radiant enthusiasm about the project in hand. Confidence in the worth-whileness of the subject has eventually to be built into the experience of the learner by his own happy results; otherwise his desire ebbs away. The good teacher builds up the desire to learn. The good leader generates a willingness to be led and a sense of its promise and value for the follower.

Second, learning starts at the point of the *learner's* present total outlook and equipment. The new objective and data to be learned have to be obviously *related* to what he now knows and feels. Without a clear sense on his part of some connection of the new with the familiar, a beginning can hardly be made. The good teacher knows the mind of the learner just as the good leader should know the present outlook of the led upon their common cause. The learning process starts from there—not from some more advanced point which the teacher or leader may himself have reached.

In fact, too much time can hardly be spent by the leader in getting an accurate knowledge as to where his followers stand mentally and emotionally regarding the purpose in hand. This is true when a new group comes together, when new members join a group or when a leader believes that the time has come when the group purpose has to be altered in any way. What in politics is called "keeping close to the constituency" is a responsibility of every kind of leader who wants to bring his followers along the educational road he sees as necessary to further the common ends.

Third, learning involves *the whole organism*. The pupil has to think, to feel and to act appropriately for the process to go on successfully. "The one who is doing the learning must do the learning." The change comes within the learner—or there is no learning. We arbitrarily divide this process by reference to "intellectual," "emotional" and "motor" appeals or approaches. But in fact no such division exists. Learning the French language involves the whole person no less than does learning to drive an automobile. And one reason why the educational process seems so often not to "take" and to leave so little residuum of permanent change in the individual, is that learning has not been

completed, has not involved the whole person, has not related itself to his total outlook. Much that passes for learning is memorized information, a verbal glibness about matters not emotionally felt or an emotional glow about something, the relationship of which to the rest of living is unrecognized.

It is important to dwell upon the failure along this line of much so-called learning, because it helps to account for frequent failures in leadership. The widely met fact that "a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still" means for the leader that his effort to effect a change in a follower has not touched him deeply enough, has not influenced his profound convictions or his emotional prejudices. In short, the leader may fail to carry conviction if he ignores the follower's desires and his past background of experience.

Learning, change of outlook, the acceptance of new purpose—these all are *active* experiences. And they are, too, the results of experiencing. Beyond a certain point there is no short-cutting the process; there is little vicarious learning.

It may occasionally seem to be true that in relation to group objectives we take other people's word for them and act accordingly. When this is done and there is uncritical acceptance of already formulated aims, there is learning and true acceptance only at the point where the individual finds in action that the aims are commendable because satisfying to him. The test is not the verbal assent; it is the felt satisfaction after experience. For if under such conditions of acceptance of a leader's aim, we find that it gets us into trouble, that the aim proves in action to be unimportant or disadvantageous to us, we rapidly abandon it; and the learning process has only been one of knowing something which we do *not* want.

A man wrote recently, "I voted for Harding for president because I've always voted the Republican ticket. I voted for Coolidge because he went to the same college I did. I voted for Hoover because I believed he was a great constructive engineer. Hereafter I'm going to vote for the candidate who holds out the best promise of a better life for my children." This man's political purposes were gradually being modified by the character of the results he felt were accruing from political objectives.

The illustration cited in an earlier chapter of the company owner who let a foreman be selected although he was not convinced of his fitness for the job, similarly shows how the learning process works.

In short, the leader has to be sure that his followers are enabled to go through much the same experiences as have led him to believe in his objectives, if they are to hold these same objectives with anything like equal zeal. This is, in fact, one of the few basic principles of successful leading. It may not be possible to fulfill this prescription in every case. But the back sliders, the doubters, the faint-hearted and the passive supporters of a cause come from among those whose experiences have not been sufficiently similar in range and emotional depth to those of the leader to have brought them along the same road of desire and conviction.

Let us, then, state the principle. *The leader can most surely count upon the sustained support of the led when they have been through experiences sufficiently like his to have brought them to the same conclusions about what they want and how in general they shall try to get it.*

The same process which goes on in the initial building up of learning or of acquiring for oneself the objectives of a group, applies equally with respect to the process of changing objectives. In a previous chapter the illus-

tration of the western city which reorganized the
methods of supporting its hospital brought out this
identical truth. People were brought to learn and change
their point of view by a total educational experience
commonly shared. The process of altering their method
of obtaining what they wanted and thus jointly solving
a community problem *was* the process of education.

Fourth, and growing out of this requirement, is the
teacher's duty of guiding the learner's experiences and
thinking, and supplying the data or problem setting
which constitutes the immediate subject-matter of the
learning. The teacher makes the learner face up to and
realize the relevance of issues, fields of study or im-
mediate problems which then come to disturb the
student. His curiosity, his confusion and his unhappi-
ness before an unsolved difficulty are all factors used
by the teacher as forces to motivate a change. And this
implies clear awareness by the learner of the detailed
facts about his difficulties.

It is not that the teacher supplies the answer.
Rightly conceived, the process calls for the teacher's
putting the learner in the way of a gradual self-dis-
closing of the answer—if any answer is to be found. If
the teacher knows the "right" answer, he is a good
teacher in so far as the learner proves to himself that his
answer and the teacher's agree. But there will be
situations in which the teaching process properly
brings for the learner an answer different from the one
held by the teacher. In such instances the teaching is
successful if the learner's answer or solution has been
arrived at under the guidance of an objective of truth
seeking, of completeness of factual analysis, of candor
and insight in forming conclusions.

Here again the parallel with the process of leading
is close. The leader, too, should help to arouse interest

in his and the group's objectives; should, by having the issues clearly brought into view, help to place the followers in problem situations where the pressure of circumstances more or less inevitably moves them on through experiences, the impact and consequence of which are in the direction of a new conclusion.

The good leader may sometimes win temporary support for his objectives by impassioned verbal advocacy of them. But real support for most objectives has to come from an experience which is deeper than listening to exhortation. It has to come from an experience which is felt at once in the motor, emotional and intellectual parts of the follower's being. When someone says with conviction and enthusiasm, "This is a swell outfit to work for," the chances are that he feels that he has been "treated right."

One final aspect of the teaching process should be noted. Learning takes time. In this cumulative experiencing process there must be time for the impact of successive, disconcerting and illuminating experiences to take place. Beyond a point this cannot be hurried or forced. The teacher and the leader must have faith in the germinative, fructifying power of rightly directed experiences to lead on to changes of attitude. And this faith, of course, is not arbitrary. It is based upon the observed tendency for similar influences to evoke similar reactions in human behavior and conviction. This is not the same as saying that the same facts lead in rational minds to identical conclusions. Sometimes they do; but the same facts do not always have the same weight in the minds of different people, nor are the steps in the reasoning process always gone through with equal care and accuracy.

People, in short, do not come to agree in group efforts because of purely rational processes and reasoned con-

clusions. Agreement comes, and reasoned deliberation may and should help to bring it. But agreement is a result of something more than intellectual processes and appeals. It is a result of individuals' *desiring* to agree and *feeling better* when they are at one with groups of their fellows.

People come to agree, moreover, because they have suffered through the same stresses and strains and have found that a sense of harmony, direction and integration is achieved as they espouse certain purposes. It is in this deeper sense that similar problems give rise to similar desires and reactions and thus facilitate agreement. And because the whole person must be implicated at a deeper level than reasoning, plenty of time is essential to the process.

Let us now apply this idea of the leader's need for a teaching sense to a specific example of the process as a whole. Take the relatively simple case of a president of a corporation who, as its virtual leader, wants to induce his board of directors to favor an important change of policy. Suppose he wants them to agree to enter into a collective agreement with a labor union which is largely represented among the manual workers of his company. Here is an issue on which strong convictions and deep prejudices are likely to be met. What is the process of leading here as it calls into use this teaching sense?

The first step of conveying a sense of the significance of the issue is readily taken. The implications of the problem will be quickly appreciated by the directors.

The second step, of starting with the present outlook of the members of the board and moving on from there, requires more thought. Why has Mr. A. such pronounced anti-union views? Why is Mr. B. sympathetic to unions but insistent on the "principle of the open shop"? Is the open shop aspect a real part of the present

problem? Why does Mr. C. believe that all union leaders are corrupt?,

The leader must go behind the evident attitudes of each member and try to see why they arise. How can their prejudices be brought into question and scrutinized afresh? Unless the directors are remarkably like-minded, the educational process has to a certain extent to be individualized and made a matter of personal conference prior to and supplementary to the formal meetings of the board.

The aim of the personal conferences is to discuss the desirability of the new policy in the light of each member's objections, to point out the president's reasons for his own view and to show how other companies have successfully adopted a similar procedure. It may prove useful to have the presidents of one or two other companies who have prestige in the eyes of the board appear before it and relate their experiences.

The board may then eventually say in effect to the president: "We are not sure about this. But we trust you and if you advocate this policy we will back you up in giving it a trial." In this case the educational process has made a real advance. But it comes more fully to completion only after the trial is in process. Perhaps the moment arrives when the board says: "You took the right line; things are working out splendidly. We agree your policy was correct." At that point a learning experience has been completed.

But if the new arrangement does not work out well in action, a definite but different learning result has been obtained when the board says: "We are convinced by this trial that your stand was wrong. We therefore purpose doing so and so."

Let us consider a different kind of learning experience as suggesting how an open-minded executive leader may

teach himself as well as provide an educational experience for his followers. By taking a teaching instead of a domineering point of view, a leader almost unwittingly caused the creation of a valuable new piece of negotiative machinery. This is the record of the origin of the arbitration board of the William Filene's Sons Company.[3]

Early in 1901, so the story goes, the head cashier walked into Edward A. Filene's office. Her feelings ran high. One of her assistants had been charged for a shortage in her cash account. It was all wrong, she thought, to deduct for shortages and to do nothing about "overages." The firm simply pocketed the latter and kept mum. Why shouldn't the cashiers be credited with them? The present system seemed to her entirely unfair. Didn't Mr. Filene think so?

He rather did. There was, however, another side to the story. The rule had been made in order to check carelessness and dishonesty. The firm had to have some means of protecting itself against losses. Accuracy was the goal.

"But an overage," argued the head cashier, "is just as much an inaccuracy as a shortage."

"To be consistent," answered Mr. Filene, "we should penalize you for both."

There might be something in what Mr. Filene had said, but the head cashier couldn't see it. If cashiers were charged for shortages, she was still convinced that they should be credited with "overages."

Mr. Filene suggested arbitration. The cashier could choose anyone she wished to represent her side of the case. He would choose someone to represent his. These two would choose a third. Their decision would be binding. It was. From that time to the present, cashiers have been credited on paper with their "overages." Nor for the last several years have they been made to pay for their shortages. Thus was arbitration inaugurated at Filene's.

Still another case is that of a personnel manager of a small factory who was authorized by his company to take the necessary steps for the installation of a group

insurance policy. This entailed obtaining the consent of
at least seventy-five per cent of the workers to have a
small contribution deducted from their pay each week,
in return for which a lump-sum death benefit would
be paid as well as certain weekly compensations in the
event of illness.

The first (and inadequate) method for securing the
assent of the workers was a mimeographed ballot in
the pay envelope accompanied by a short explanatory
letter. The response to this only gave a forty per cent
support and that came from workers over thirty-five
years of age. At the suggestion of the insurance com-
pany, the personnel manager then went into each
department and called all the workers together to
present the insurance plan and to answer any questions
face to face. This time he was also armed with a
facsimile copy of a one thousand dollar check made out
to the widow of a recently deceased worker in a neigh-
boring plant where a similar plan was in effect. This
evidence dramatized the appeal, as the worker who had
died in the other company was known to some of the
employees.

As a result of this method of presentation, when
another vote was taken over ninety-five per cent signed
up. And as a further measure of persuasion, a similar
facsimile of the first death benefit paid under this
new policy was passed around in the several depart-
ments. The support of the employees was thus gained
and held.

This was the leader acting as teacher in a typically
effective way.

All of these instances suggest the value of a teaching
sense with particular reference to matters of attitude,
policy and new procedure. Leaders are often ready
enough to agree that they must be responsible for job

training. Indeed the technique of this has been so well elaborated in recent years that' they are not here being considered.

But leaders show a marked tendency to forget that a similar technique of teaching has to be applied wherever proposals concerning the relations of members of an organization to the organization itself are under advisement. It is just as important to have a teaching sense in these matters of attitude as it is in job instruction. In fact, it is more important because the right way to educate people into a change of attitude or acceptance of new general procedure is less well understood.

Finally, the necessity for reenforcing the process of teaching by a conscious program of training should be stressed. Such training may have different objectives, such as job fitness, upgrading, improved supervision, better job morale and the development of minor executives as leaders. But no one of these will progress far without a plan of training which in addition to the right teaching process provides the enthusiastic support of the leaders *as* teachers.

In conclusion, it should now be clear that the educational process is not complete short of an *active experience of participation in a favorable result* by those being led. Their reaction has passed from the realm of opinion into that of a fully sensed conviction only when the leader has helped them through situations which changed their aims. The leader who is too impatient to employ a teaching sense, as thus conceived, simply cannot get permanent results. For such results grow only out of those truly self-propelling motives which are effective because those being led *know* they are getting increased satisfaction.

CHAPTER IX

METHODS AND MANNERS OF LEADING

EVERY art has techniques for giving it acceptable effect. This is true of the exercise of leadership. When it comes to the actual hour-by-hour contact of the leader with his followers there is a variety of methods which experience shows are the necessary ways to make that contact truly fruitful. Conscious cultivation of them can improve both the leader's quality of executive conduct in general and its leadership value in particular. This is where the leader's conduct can be specifically studied, regulated and altered for the better by deliberate intention.

The techniques which are important here will be discussed under the following headings:

1. Giving orders.
2. Giving reproofs.
3. Giving commendation.
4. Maintaining a right personal bearing.
5. Getting suggestions.
6. Strengthening a sense of group identity.
7. Care in introduction to the group.
8. Creating group self-discipline.
9. Allaying false rumors.

GIVING ORDERS

The fact of giving an order is not so simple as it might first appear. Before stating how to give orders, it is important to ask why orders are given, what they really are and when they are needed.

The modern conception of order-giving in a well-organized and well-run corporate group is, first, that the order grows out of the situation and relationship. It is a functional fact—not primarily a personal one. Orders are in such cases more often "standing orders," "instructions" or "standard practices" to be followed. The order is implicit in the task or duty to be performed. If each task which a member has to perform requires much special bossing and personal order-giving, the plan of operation is seriously defective; and the difficulty of knowing how to "obey" the leader is correspondingly increased for the worker.

Each individual should know, as a result of good training, what is expected of him and what are the standards of good performance. When this prior condition of planned mapping-out of operation prevails, order-giving is automatically reduced to a minimum.

This requirement of studied, standardized and scheduled activity is the essence of what has come to be termed "scientific management." The approach to the executive problem which scientific management involves is definite, tested and sound. It subordinates order-giving to the establishing of correct instructions and practices. The executive is then able to center his attention away from routines upon efforts at stimulation and coordination.

Everyone who wants to transform his executive task into one of leadership should, therefore, early in his training become familiar with the principles and general procedures which scientific management entails.[1] For their application to all types of organization can readily be made—and should be made.

Indeed, one authority believes that what he calls the "psychology of the ticket" is a valuable adjunct in this connection. He points out that where work can be so

well laid out that a worker gets a "job ticket" for his day's work-assignment and thus knows in advance just what he is expected to do that day, his sense of self-respect at his job is enhanced. And he realizes that he can proceed at his work without interference.

One cannot but contrast this kind of arrangement with that which appears to cause much discord and turnover among domestic servants. Especially where there is but one servant and the mistress of the house is at home all day, testimony is general that the hour-to-hour work of the maid is constantly being interfered with by the employer's insisting that every petty detail be done in the way she specifies. Failing to realize that the maid's way may be equally good or better, the employer exercises too constant a supervision, to the exasperation of any self-reliant and competent worker in the home.

In a word, order-giving can wisely be reduced to a minimum. But obviously it cannot be done away with.

There is, first, the "exception principle" to be noted. Either the worker in a group discovers that some circumstance has arisen which his standard-practice instructions do not cover, or the executive leader knows that in a particular case changes in procedure are required which are exceptional. The necessity for definite instruction here is clear and the worker will readily acknowledge this.

Then there are emergencies which must be specially dealt with. Here the leader is looked to for the line to follow. For example, the power goes off; the lights go out; a fire starts; someone is hurt. The leader must here step in and take command of the situation. And if he is not able to cope with the emergency he is no leader.

✓ Problems of working method will also arise. The worker will come to the executive supervisor and say,

"I don't understand what I'm expected to do here," or "I don't know how to do this."

Finally, the relationships among individual workers, or the interrelationship of groups or of departments, often require special adjustments which may entail giving orders.

These order-giving situations should be differentiated, because it is important to bring out that, under proper conditions, the few direct orders which have to be given grow normally out of inevitable relations of workers to their task or to the organization. They are not properly an occasion for resentment. When resentment does arise, either the order-giving is being poorly done or the need for the order is occasioned by annoying and unnecessary defects in organized planning and control.

In short, orders are expected, are inevitable and are in certain circumstances welcomed. And it is sentimental to believe that the good leader when uniting the desires and intentions of his followers can remain exempt from this occasionally important duty.

It is clear, however, that the good leader will have brought his supporting organization to such a point of methodical functioning that it will seem much of the time to run itself.

There are, of course, good and poor ways of giving such orders as are necessary.

Be clear is one essential. Orders are primarily transmitted in *words*. And words have therefore to be carefully chosen. It must be assured that the words used mean the same thing to speaker and listener. This is equally important whether the spoken or printed word is employed. There must be no room for ambiguity.

Remove all possible doubt as to your meaning by having the one to whom the order or instruction is

addressed indicate definitely in some way that he knows what is desired. This can sometimes be done by having him repeat the order in his own words, or by supervising the beginning of the task to ascertain that it is going forward properly. The test of the leader's clarity is not his own sense of it, but the grasp of the order as revealed in the behavior of the follower.

Remember, in this connection, that many people are poor verbalizers. Their vocabularies are limited and they are neither trained nor accustomed to put their ideas and feelings into precise and accurate words. In fact, they are likely to feel themselves on the defensive in the presence of those directing them who may have a facility with words. This seeming advantage of a larger vocabulary presents a real danger for the leader.

Be explicit. Let it be known what the limits of individual discretion are in deciding upon the ways and means of doing an assignment. The encouragement of initiative and of a sense of personal responsibility is important. But the worker should know how much initiative he is allowed and at what points, and the range of his responsibility should be defined. Broadly speaking, the greater the latitude which the follower can be given in choosing his own working methods, the more educational will be the result. But where uniformity of process and product and complete adherence to specifications are essentials, that should be clearly understood.

✓ *Use your voice to good effect.* Orders should be imparted in a natural, vigorous, firm tone of voice— one not strained or high in key because of annoyance, exasperation, fatigue or anger. There seems to be good evidence for the conclusion that a good voice is a most important element in the leader's equipment. Apparently the quality of the voice can convey directly

some sense of assurance, firmness and assertiveness which people tend to heed and respect. A low, positive tone accompanied by clear and not too hurried enunciation is, for example, invaluable as suggesting poise and an impersonal command of the situation.

If a question is raised so that the order has to be repeated or amplified, do not become petulant or shrill. The slowness or stupidity of the one receiving the command may not be his fault. But if it is, and if it is innate and irremediable, the person may be unsuited to the task or the organization; and the fault, if any, may rest upon the one who did the initial selecting.

This danger of becoming annoyed at the superficial manifestations of trouble, rather than being patient enough to try to get to the bottom of it, is one to be constantly guarded against. More often than not, where the leader finds himself getting annoyed, the visible occasion may only be an indication of some more deep-seated trouble, the blame for which rests upon the leader himself.

One result of a show of anger, as we shall see later, is that it gets the angry person into such a frame of mind that he is not able to become interested in correcting the underlying causes of the difficulty.

The department head in a large insurance company well illustrated this point when he was called upon within the same week by two clerks who had just completed a year of service with the company and had come to ask for a raise in salary. They had been told by the employment manager when they were hired that such salary reviews occurred at each anniversary of employment. But the department head had lost or forgotten the office memorandum which had been sent him putting this new policy of salary review

into effect. He became very angry and gave each girl a severe talking to about how fortunate she was to have such a good job "in these times." The girls took their troubles back to the employment manager and the necessary adjustments were finally made. But the department head was in error and his exasperation was, of course, premature and ill-advised.

It is true also that the set of the countenance when one is giving orders is important. Most of us are unconscious that we naturally express an attitude toward others in the habitual expression of our own faces. Some are able to *look* cheerful, calm, encouraging; some do not realize that they look gloomy or impatient, irritated or unfriendly. Our faces tend to reflect our dispositions. But these dispositions are not unalterable, and he who would wear a kindly mask should cultivate a kindly disposition.

It was said of a prominent executive leader by one of his colleagues, "His smile alone is worth a million dollars. It comes like a flash illuminating a face which, if it always has something friendly, does not advertise what is going on behind it."

If recourse to one's mirror shows that one is afflicted with a chronic scowl or tension of anxiety, or a look of aloofness or disdain, that is a decided drawback upon effectiveness in relations with followers and specifically in giving necessary orders in a persuasive way. In such cases the physical or mental sources of harmony within one's own self are often blocked, and a conscious search for the causes has to be made if a more attractive expression is to be achieved.

Phrase your orders courteously. In general the use of the direct, bold imperative is to be avoided. "Do this!" "Do that!" This is an unfortunate method of command, both because it indicates the existence of an

inconsiderate attitude toward the one being commanded, and because the effect of this form and of the tone which usually accompanies it is inhibiting and chilling. There is no attempt to win, to conciliate, to explain, to unify intentions. The leader's desires seem to be so all-absorbing that the follower feels that his own reactions are being completely ignored or over-ridden.

Even to preface the command with a "Please" does not always, from the follower's point of view, remove the sting of bluntness and arrogant imposition of another's will. The follower's point of view, his integrity and self-regard have continuously to be held in view. And the order must be phrased in such a way and uttered in such a tone of voice that the follower automatically senses that his personal feelings and interests in the matter *are being taken account of*— not being taken for granted. The bullying or condescending tone is almost sure to be resented, even though the resentment is not immediately evident.

Many executives say that they never make a flat direct command. They say, "Don't you think it would be a good idea if we . . . " or "I wonder if you'd be good enough to . . . " or "Don't you think we'd better . . . " or "Will you please."

> One of his assistants [says Miss Tarbell][2] talking of Mr. Young as a trainer of young men, told me that in all the three years he was with him—and he sat always in his chief's office —he never heard him say to anyone, "Do this or do that"; never, "Don't do this or don't do that"; but always, "You might consider this." I've never had an order, it was always a suggestion. Frequently he would say after he had dictated a letter, "What do you think of this?" In looking over one of my letters he would say, "Maybe if we would phrase it this way it would be better."

The courteous phrasing may seem weak and in-
effectual to bosses of the old school. And there may
perhaps be groups of men accustomed to working at
rough labor under tobacco-chewing, oath-loving gang
bosses who would be surprised enough at any sudden
mollifying of the tone and temper of command. Yet
all this is certainly a survival of the old days which
is at the opposite pole from the exercise of leadership
as properly viewed today. And it does in fact give
rise to resentment, sullen submission, a subtle sense
of personal dignity affronted.

True it is that in the workaday world gentleness
of manner may be misunderstood by those who are
not accustomed to it. It may readily be mistaken for
flabbiness. For this reason it is important for the
naturally mild-mannered leader to convey an impression
of positiveness and firmness, however restrained his
demeanor may be. When a leader finds his orders are
not taken seriously and he has to repeat them to get
results, his technique is deficient in some particular
and he should study to correct it.

The conclusion is inevitable that good leadership
implies good manners, from top to bottom of the social
and economic scale. And never was this truer than
under the democratic conditions of today. Even in the
situations where a military obedience has historically
been thought essential—on ship board, in the army
and navy—there has in recent years come a marked
change in tactics and attitude. The order may be
crisply given, but the personal (and legal) relationship
of order-giver to order-taker has altered so that a
noticeable change in the manner of address has occurred.

It is not a mollycoddling of followers to treat them
courteously. It is rather the outward and conventional
sign of an inner awareness of *their* selfhood and of their

rights. And without this awareness command does not rise to the level of leading.

One fears that the comment offered on executive manners in the Congressional Report on the Homestead Steel strike of the early 1890's might still prove a correct characterization of situations where conflicts of employers and employees are by way of reaching an acute crisis. "We do not think," said the Congressmen, "that the officers of this company exercised the degree of patience, indulgence and solicitude which they should have. . . . Mr. Frick, who is a business man of great energy and intelligence, seemed to have been too stern, brusque and somewhat autocratic."[3]

Do not give too many orders at once. This creates confusion, slowness of assimilation and bewilderment about the priority of the things to be done. Keep orders simple; keep them in time sequence; and space them in time so that first things will assuredly be done first.

Try to minimize negative commands. Try to keep orders positive in content. There is something in human nature which at once becomes curious and interested about what it is told not to do. Of course there are things which are not to be done. But if attention is focused on what is to be done, if stimulation and support are offered for doing them, there is usually little time left to explore all the undesirable alternatives. Also, as a matter of time, in a well-organized group it is possible to convince people more quickly of the desirability of what contributes to the group's purpose, than it is to demonstrate convincingly that all the "thou shalt nots" are necessary. The whole art in leading, as in education, is to build up desire into such a strong, moving force that the distracting and retarding influences have literally no chance to attract the followers' attention.

Be sure, finally, not to issue mutually contradictory orders. This would hardly be done intentionally; but it is done in cases where the leader is himself confused. Where orders have to be countermanded and for some reason altered in a drastic way, the follower should be made to know that the leader realizes exactly what he is doing and has a good reason for it.

GIVING REPROOF

Most organizations have aims of which the leader himself as a person is merely the focus. The follower is by no means always supposed to be loyal to the leader as an individual, but rather to him as exemplar or focal point of an objective to be achieved. This is one good reason why the process of giving reprimands and of offering criticism should be kept by the leader on as *impersonal* a plane as possible. The leader is only the agent of the organized purpose when he exposes the shortcomings of the individual. There will, of course, be personal frictions and temperamental stresses which intrude when the leader criticizes. But the act of giving reproof should be kept as objective as possible. This is admittedly a counsel of perfection; but most leaders can do much more to approximate it than they do.

First, *be sure you have your facts.* Be sure that the cause of the trouble lies with the individual being reproved. He may have been working under adverse physical surroundings, with poor equipment for which he is not responsible, with materials of poor quality over which he has no control or with insufficient instructions. Also, in ordinary group relations, ignorance of the "law" of the group may well be a valid excuse for violations. The leader must assure himself that the delinquent did know the rules which he has transgressed. For leadership has the initial duty of being

certain that the followers really understand whatever regulations and rules exist. Ignorance of those rules by the group is presumptively a fault of the leader in the first instance.

The importance of having your facts is amusingly illustrated by the story of an executive who went into the shipping room and saw a messenger boy sitting on a bench whistling in a nonchalant way. He was annoyed by the picture and said to the boy, "How much do you get a week?" "Ten dollars," was the reply. "Well, here's your ten dollars; now get out. We don't want you here." After he had left the executive discovered that the boy was a messenger from another company waiting for a parcel!

As a matter of fact, the occasions for reproof which arise because of deliberate, willful violation of regulations are surprisingly few. And it becomes the primary task of leaders to be in possession of all the facts before reprimands are given or penalties imposed.

Have any schedule of regulations, prohibitions and penalties as simple and definite as possible. Have them thoroughly publicized throughout the group. Preferably have their formulation and acceptance a process in which the group participates.

Administer the application of any such schedule with even-handed justice, without partiality or animus.

In this connection it is only natural to bear in mind that the leader will not like all his followers equally well. There will inevitably arise unaccountable personal antipathies and temperamental incompatibilities. These may lead to less than completely impartial treatment of all members, unless the leader keeps this danger constantly in mind. He would be a paragon of mental balance who remained uninfluenced by personal likes and dislikes. Yet the natural effort to justify such prejudices in

making decisions can only be minimized if the leader
is aware that this is something to be constantly guarded
against.

Another truth to be borne in mind in giving reproof
has to do with a better grasp of the reasons for failures
which have to be dealt with. E. D. Smith has well
called attention to this when he says that "people
very rarely fail because they intend to. They fail
because they fail to do what they intend to do."[4] And
he might have added with equal truth that sometimes,
under the stress of some sudden emotion, they impul-
sively do the wrong thing.

In handling such cases, Mr. Smith points out that
the executive leader is likely to fall into two errors.
First, he may construe vindictively and emotionally
acts which were innocently meant—and thus arouse
vindictiveness and resentment in response. Or he may
antagonize or discourage others by not understanding
the cause of the failure. In such situations, the reproof
needs to be carefully handled. The tone of voice,
especially, has to be guarded so as not to betray a wrong
attitude. We often fail to appreciate how much a
negative, exasperated attitude toward others can be
unintentionally conveyed in this way—less by what is
said than by the way in which it is said.

Offer reproof in private. The process of reproving is
essentially a *corrective* one. The effort should primarily
be in the direction of getting the offender to realize
that he was wrong and why, but even more of getting
him so readjusted with respect to his own motives
that he will be anxious not to repeat the offense. And
if the rebuke is offered before other members of the
group there is a danger that it will produce vindictive-
ness. In short, it may create a psychological setting
in which emotion of a destructive kind is released on

both sides and no change of motive has come to the offender.

The leader who, when reproof is necessary, gives vent to his emotional disturbances and enjoys his own emotional orgy of temper or disappointment is, of course, seriously misconceiving his job.

The real function of the reprimand is preventive— to try to assure that this particular difficulty does not arise again and that the right working attitude and relation of the individual to the group are fully restored.

One helpful step to this end is to try whenever possible to preface a reproof with a statement made in a pleasant tone of voice in appreciation of the good things in the individual's record. "Jim," said a manager, "you've been with us twelve years and you've always been a good worker. We've always counted on you as one of the most reliable men in the foundry. That's why I was very surprised when Mr. Clark (the foreman) told me that these defective castings had been traced back to your work." Such an introduction to a heart-to-heart talk is certainly far more likely to lead to constructive results than a direct, accusing attack— no matter where the fault lay.

The appeal should be as positive as possible— distinguishing the faulty deed from the presumed goodwill of the person. Let the assumption be that the shortcoming was a lapse, unless the evidence convincingly shows that it was deliberate. Violent language, sarcasm and a hard voice are dangerous weapons because they prompt the person criticized to defense, argument and counter-attack. The result is a debate and ill will—not education.

The distinction also should be kept in mind between the act of giving reproof and the act of making known throughout the group what penalty has been imposed.

It is almost as bad to have fellow-members think that nothing has been done to correct a known breach, as it is to ignore it altogether. Once the reprimand has been administered in cases where everyone knows of the difficulty, the leader himself should usually acquaint his followers with the disposition of the case, not leaving it to the aggrieved party to report to his fellows only his side of the outcome and his possible sense of being too severely dealt with.

Do not use anger to enforce corrective measures. There are, of course, some executive leaders who claim that an occasional angry "blow-off" is wholesome for the organization and that they deliberately stage a show of anger when in reality they have their emotions completely under control. This method deserves one or two comments.

If a show of anger is being relied upon to tone up a group and bring its performance back to concert pitch, the leader is relying on fear to stimulate effort in the followers. He is not using the creative appeal; he is not recalling them to the attractive power of their common objective.

Also, however much a show of anger may be staged by the executive it rarely seems thus to the group. It appears to be what it more usually is—a loss of self-control because something has failed to run smoothly. And people properly mistrust a loss of self-control, especially if it becomes frequent. For under the stress of such emotion, the leader is almost sure to lose sight of some of the factors which need correction if the cause of the outburst is to be removed. It is hard to be fair, to keep in mind the other person's point of view and to be truly educational when one is angry. The leader's anger is a boomerang—coming back to hurt himself far more than it can possibly help others.

Also, simulation of a show of anger may all too easily pass over into the real thing. It takes a remarkable actor not to become identified with the part he is playing; and in the process of pretending one may well convince himself that his anger should be genuine, even if it did not start that way.

In general the first way to minimize the arousing of anger and temper is *to try to control the circumstances which may prompt them*. Good physical condition in the leader can help here. Fatigue, organic disorders and worries—these make it easier for anger to appear. Poor planning, careless instructions, loose and poorly conceived organization and direction of work—these are fruitful causes of failure of the group to do what is expected. And therefore they are fruitful causes of the leader's anger.

Where temperamental difficulties appear between leader and members, these too should be handled as realities necessary to cope with. "He gets my goat." "I just can't stand having him around." These are sentiments which lead to personal outbursts. And the wise leader will see that so far as possible such personal reactions are kept at a minimum by a wise placement or replacement of such disaffected individuals, or by a conscious effort to overcome such antipathies by special efforts at friendliness.

In short, anger is a two-edged weapon. It may seem momentarily to precipitate action, to convince followers of the intensity of the leader's desires. But its very intensity is disruptive. Whether the leader uses it by chance or by intention, its power dwindles with repeated use. People come to expect, to discount, even to be amused by exhibitions of lost self-control.

Treat insubordination firmly and promptly. There will arise occasions when for some reason the follower

refuses to do what is asked of him, when he does something which he knows is contrary to the established working relationships or when he definitely repudiates the objectives of the group.

The leader's action in such case will usually be doubly effective if it is prompt and definite. It is the immediate firmness shown rather than the severity of the penalty which is the impressive fact. Nevertheless even here the leader should be certain he has all the facts and that the fault lies in the motives of the offender and not in defects, of the organization.

Just what lies behind the offender's actions must be grasped if intelligent treatment is to follow. In many cases the wise effort will be to try to restore the individual to loyalty and good standing. But where such a reconciliation seems impossible to effect, it will be important to have the one who is being asked to leave the group convict himself and agree that separation is inevitable.

One thing is certain. The ideal of trying to be sure that all members of a group are continuously loyal to its purposes must be striven for. And those who are not loyal and are in danger of becoming a disruptive force require the leader's special attention. (Such statements always assume that the purposes of the group merit the individual's loyalty.)

In concluding this discussion of reproof an incident may be recalled which will superficially seem to contradict what has just been said, although in reality it suggests that great admiration of the followers for the leader can sometimes make otherwise unendurable criticisms tolerable. A visitor was present at a rehearsal of the Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra at which Toscanini was conducting. He had been especially vehement throughout the session about the poor quality

of the performance. It had been an unusually gruelling rehearsal. As the players left the hall the visitor commented to one of the violinists upon the harshness of the conductor's denunciations. "Oh," he said, "we would rather have him abuse us than have most conductors praise us!"

GIVING COMMENDATION

Another factor of tremendous importance is the *assurance that good performance is being appreciated by the leader.* People unquestionably sustain effort and do better work when they are commended at judicious intervals than when they are being constantly criticized. Commendation for most people acts like a tonic and a spur. One is anxious to merit a continuance of the leader's regard, attention and favor. Commendation clearly establishes the fact that one is in harmony with the objective, and a happy flow of energy results.

Indeed we are in possession of a good deal of experimental evidence from tests with young people in school that performance when praise and encouragement are given is astonishingly higher in quantity and quality than where they are withheld. Apparently the whole organism and the whole group situation are both lubricated and stimulated by a sense of knowing that efforts are appreciated.

The most serious weakness of many would-be leaders is their reluctance to offer explicit approval. Many executives seem to be constitutionally unable to say that a job has been well done. They fear that a relaxing of effort will be the result of praise, whereas in fact the exact opposite is the normal outcome.

Don't be afraid to give praise, and give it often enough so that its sustaining power will not be lost. One execu-

tive has colloquially expressed his own formula by advising "two pats on the back for one kick in the pants!"

The sound use of commendation requires that one or two attendant conditions be provided. The leader must have some procedure for knowing when approval is merited. That means having standards of performance and records of individual or group achievement. The more objective and definite the measure of results can be, the more fair and definite the approval will be. Here again a result of good scientific organization will be to provide the leader with such standards and records. Rating scales of various kinds, which are coming (although still experimentally) into wider and wider use, are a further aid in assuring periodic review of individual attainment in efforts by a management to have the individual know that good work is appreciated and rewarded.[5] Some systematic method, especially in large groups, of being sure that occasions for offering approval do not come too infrequently is virtually indispensable for the good leader. The actual voicing of approval, however, should be spontaneous and personal.

Again, the leader must know which individuals profit from approval and which do not. Some few people are so self-centered that they construe the act of being singled out for praise as a special personal preferment by the leader, one which allows them special favors. In short, they get swelled heads and are likely to convey to their associates the impression that they "stand in with the boss" in a way that will readily be interpreted by others as favoritism. Where this is the reaction to approval, the usual prescriptions do not hold.

Also, while a rebuke should usually be given in private, commendation can often do most good when

it is given in public, or under circumstances where the group will know that merit has been recognized.

Next to the approval of the admired leader, people value the approval of associates. And the good leader will see to it that the support of group approval comes to one who has deserved it. Intelligent publicity regarding rewards for individual or group merit is essential to good morale.

Irrespective of one's general opinion of the Russian economic experiment, it is apparently true that there have been developed exceedingly effective and psychologically astute methods of public recognition for good performances in industry. The whole apparatus of their publicity machinery is focused on bringing recognition and esteem to superior workers.[6]

The danger in our own country is that too little praise is given rather than too much. It is the rare leader today of whom it could be said that he "slops over" in telling his followers how well they are doing. Of course too much praise, or praise uncritically given, loses its tonic value. Judgment and good sense must be exercised. But individuals properly crave the assurance and the confidence which come from knowing that they stand well as members of the groups to which they belong.

MAINTAINING A RIGHT PERSONAL BEARING

The total bearing and appearance of the leader before his group are too little recognized as having an important influence upon his effectiveness. These are usually unconscious attributes and derivatives of personality. But they can be made conscious and, if the mirror is candidly held up to nature, changes can be made which will help the total bearing to reflect a right attitude.

Unconsciously some leaders have a slightly condescending bearing. Some appear bored or preoccupied while subordinates explain problems. There are snobbish attitudes, holier-than-thou attitudes, impatient bearings and many more. One hears executives severely criticized as "poker-faced" by followers because their expressions reveal so little. In most cases the leader does not realize that the way he looks speaks louder than what he says. Yet his bearing is either helping people to get into closer communication with him or is pushing them away.

One study of executive bearing made in a large industrial organization brought out the fact that the workers particularly resented a "snooping," "pussyfooting," spying bearing on the part of their foremen. It brought out, too, the fact that the foremen were quite unconscious of their demeanor and were glad to change it, once its unfortunate influence was pointed out.

Leaders forget that their manner of supervision may be so negative. "He rattles me when he comes around"; "he doesn't seem to know I'm here"; "he's a regular gloom artist"—these are familiar comments on the supervisor's attitude. And they are the more unfortunate because they are so completely unnecessary, if only the leader is in command of the arts of his task.

Every leader, whether of high or low estate, should possess, therefore, that candid friend who can without timidity tell him what impression his bearing, his manner of personal contacts, his facial expression, his tricks of utterance and the like, are creating.

Let the leader try occasionally to get some friendly check on the effectiveness of his personal bearing. He can hardly have a greater service done him, es-

pecially because the tendency is all the other way—for the leader to evoke admiration and to ignore the need for self-criticism.

The first injunction, then, is to be *straightforward* in personal dealings. The leader is not a spy or a policeman, or a watch dog. And he should vigorously avoid states of mind or manners of behavior which suggest these notions of this relationship to the followers.

Also there is a nice balance to be observed between friendliness or cordiality and undue familiarity.[7] The leader is surely not to be set upon any pedestal, but his effectiveness requires some differentiation of the quality of personal relation from that to be found among the followers. People resent a "high and mighty" air in their leaders; but equally they resent having them so completely one of themselves that they do not stand out as leaders.

Similarly there is a balance to be struck between firmness and kindliness. People expect the former of their leaders and they appreciate the latter. Firmness implies definiteness, clear-cut decisions, resolute holding to standards. It is essential. But so too is that regard for the personality of the followers which kindliness implies. The good leader will always remember that he is not dealing with people as *his* raw material, subject only to uses which gain *his* ends. People are always ends in themselves—to be what they will be; and they have ends of their own desiring. Leadership means a coalescing, an identification of the ends desired by leader and by led. If people are consistently dealt with as *persons* as having a right to their own ends, an attitude of kindliness will almost inevitably develop between them and their leader.

It should also hardly need to be said that the leader's bearing, no less than his conduct, *should avoid the*

accusation that he is playing favorites. This is not so easy a problem to handle wisely as might at first appear. For leaders must necessarily be able to rely with confidence on a small coterie of aids and advisors. And the bigger the project the more dependent is the leader upon such assistants. Also we all naturally tend to have confidence in our friends and therefore to gather them about us in a relationship of trust.

Favoritism really means an arbitrary preferment and advancement of certain individuals, irrespective of merit. It means that lodge connections or church, racial, political or family affiliations get exclusive consideration in groups where other standards should be wholly in force. In this sense favoritism is vicious because it undermines morale, raises questions about the integrity of the leader and casts doubts upon his zeal on behalf of the objective.

It is so important to success in leadership that followers feel that all are being fairly treated, that an illustrative evidence of this should prove suggestive. Mr. Sam A. Lewisohn, vice-president of the Miami Copper Company, records the following incident:[8]

> In a mine with which the writer is acquainted, there fortunately exists an excellent morale. The following examples of the policy pursued explain why a favorable situation exists. The superintendent of one of the departments, a valuable but excitable man, was angry with a workman over a mistake that he had made. In his excitement he grasped the workman by the arm. The latter misunderstood. A rough-and-tumble fight occurred. The manager of the mine suspended the offending superintendent, and, in spite of the willingness of the workman to drop the incident, insisted on a formal apology. In another mine, a subordinate department head discharged an engineer who had wrecked an important machine by careless manipulation. In replacing this man, he skipped the brother of the discharged engineer, who was next

in line for promotion. It looked as if the executive was punishing the man for the faults of his brother. It appeared certain that this step would create a great deal of resentment.

The manager promptly over-ruled the act of his assistant, risking the loss of a valuable executive member of his staff in so doing. It is this sort of fairness that is fundamental in any sound administrative system.

GETTING SUGGESTIONS

No leader can expect to evolve for himself all the ideas that he can fruitfully use. He needs the ideas of his group; and he needs in active deliberation with his group, or selected representatives, to evolve new ideas. This involves two requirements. There should be organized methods by which the suggestions of the group can be encouraged. And there should be organized group methods of common deliberation. This latter need is considered in the next chapter.

How, then, may all possible suggestions be secured from the group?

Responsibility for fostering an atmosphere which encourages individuals to contribute ideas to the uses of the group is peculiarly upon the leader's shoulders. People quickly learn how welcome suggestions really are, how affirmatively they are received and utilized. The way to encourage suggestions is therefore for the leader to make it evident in every conceivable way that his mind is open, that he appreciates new ideas, that he applies them where possible and that he gives due credit as to their source.

When dealing with the specific suggestions of individuals, the good leader will give every evidence of interest and anxiety to grasp the real significance of the proposal. He will act as promptly as possible to see if it is practicable. And if it cannot be adopted he

should be at pains to explain why in a manner that will not discourage a continuance of new offerings.

There is no quicker way to stifle enthusiasm and initiative in a thoughtful direction than for a leader to take over ideas and let it be understood that they are his own. There may at times well be tactical reasons why a new idea should be brought forward as the leader's. But even then there should be recognition that the leader knows to whom he is indebted. And the more this acknowledgment of indebtedness can take the form of tangible and publicly known reward, the better.

As organizations increase in size and executive leadership tends to become more bureaucratic in its relationships, this danger of leaders' appropriating and taking credit for suggestions from those in their departments may become insidious.

Suggestion systems such as are used in some factories and stores no doubt may have a certain value in assuring that credit goes where it is due. But frequently these systems degenerate into stodgy routines. No such system works well without constant executive support and encouragement. Suggestions will come from followers in direct proportion as the leader encourages them, gives credit for them and uses them.

STRENGTHENING THE SENSE OF GROUP IDENTITY

As the leader deals with organizations of larger and larger size, the more important will it be for him to foster a sense of group identity among his followers. Usually there is a positive value to morale in having people know who their group associates are. This helps to strengthen the sense of group unity and facilitates group effort.

This familiar truth is already utilized in many groups by uniforms, insignia, caps, lapel buttons, passwords and arm bands. But it needs to be more in the mind of every leader for possible application to groups which do not dramatize their means of self-identification. The leader should ask himself:

Is our organized effort capitalizing in every possible way the conscious awareness of each member that he is a member of the group and that he knows who are the other members upon whose support and cooperation he should be able to rely?

Is there some way—some use of symbol or device—by which each member may be able readily to identify his fellow-members?

There are, of course, many seemingly childish manifestations of this idea. Often the apparatus of college or fraternity identification, of fraternal lodge membership or political party devotion, may seem infantile to the outsider. But the outsider is not the fair judge. The deep psychological need of identification, of being known as one of those following an admired leader in a worthy cause—this remains as a genuine need without which there is real loss of a sense of group unity.

CARE IN INTRODUCTION TO THE GROUP

Many organizations accept new members or workers with relatively little knowledge of their working capacity or of their fitness for the organization. The new employee of a business organization is plunged into a heterogeneous mass of people often with few common ties of neighborhood, religion, educational background or race. A youngster goes away to school or college to be plunged into a setting equally lacking in unity to him as a newcomer. The new convert to

any movement may initially find his devotion to its purpose or to the leader to be his only common bond with his new colleagues.

Here is a familiar fact which many wisely led organizations are taking account of. Factories, stores, colleges, religious bodies, clubs, conventions—all kinds of groups today have developed careful procedures for introducing the newcomer. And every leader, irrespective of the size of his group, should ask himself:

Does each new member join our group in a way that facilitates his rapid and agreeable acquaintance with the rest?

Am I helping to relieve the strain of a new environment by taking all the necessary and considerate steps to introduce the newcomer happily?

The method in detail will vary with the organization. But that the process of induction be deliberately studied and specified is surely an important requirement.

CREATING GROUP SELF-DISCIPLINE

Every group naturally develops a certain tacit code of practice as to what is good form and what behavior is considerate of other members. There is an irreducible minimum of decent manners and working habits which grows up almost spontaneously. But as groups increase in size and objectives are less zealously felt by every member, it becomes essential that more definite regulations be formulated to ease the strains of association and to make the responsibilities of individual conduct clear.

It is at this stage that the problems of discipline arise. For discipline is the ordering and control of the behavior of one's self or one's group in ways designed to facilitate the accomplishment of some defined

end. Such an ordering and control are necessary. Matters of promptness and regularity, of personal frictions and animosities, of laxity of performance, of carelessness or wastefulness—these and a score of other issues arise to detract from the effectiveness with which the group's purpose is served by every member.

Personal liberty has always to be viewed both in relation to what the group wants to do and in relation to the achieving of results which satisfy each member. Individual activity in order to produce happiness has to be somewhat canalized and restricted. The only problem is how and why it is restricted. Group association, while of course restrictive, may yet be self-fulfilling *if the end is felt to be valuable* by those involved. And the leader's role is to help give meaning to the end, and value to whatever sacrifices the individual may make. When he fails in this or when the followers fail, occasion for discipline may arise.

How, then, should the leader conceive of the disciplinary problem and how should he deal with it?

Since the true leader is the summoner of the positive motives of his followers, discipline must become for him a development of *self-discipline*, both within each individual and within the group as a whole. Concretely this means that the group should help to set up its own regulations, should participate in the dealings with offenders, and should share in deciding how they shall be treated.[9]

The modern trend of all disciplinary procedure is unquestionably in this direction. Student councils in colleges and schools, shop committees and employee associations in business organizations—these are straws to show the way the wind is blowing.

Group self-discipline has efficacy, however, only as the leader is constantly active in guiding in a tactful

way the entire procedure under which discipline goes forward. He must be watchful to see that the regulations adopted are sufficiently inclusive but not arbitrarily harsh. He must see that deliberations are thoroughly informed and not swayed by prejudices and vindictiveness.

The occasion for discipline is ideally the opportunity for a valuable learning experience to go forward— for the offender, for the group and for the leader. For it to be handled on the level of simple punishment as "getting even" or "giving a man what is coming to him," is to miss entirely its true significance. Properly, it is an opportunity to review where and why the positive motives of the followers have become relaxed, and where and why managerial responsibilities have not been fully carried out.

ALLAYING FALSE RUMORS

The equanimity and working effectiveness of every kind of group are always in danger of being disturbed by false rumors and malicious gossip. Whether these focus on the leader, on other individuals or on the status of the organization as a whole makes no difference. They are distracting and exciting, they shift the center of gravity away from the purpose in hand, and are therefore unfortunate. Also they enhance unwarrantedly the ego of the one who imparts the rumor, scandal or falsehood.

The leader should always seek *to trace rumor or gossip back to its source.* And if that source proves, as it often does, to be continually the same, the difficulty is already half solved.

Sometimes the rumor-monger is a pathological case— or verging on it. He has a delusion of persecution;

he has a grudge; he has an unsatisfied ambition. But he must be dealt with individually and effectively.

Many times, also, the organization is so niggardly of the information it offers to its members that rumors grow to help account for policies or activities which are not understood. There is a peculiar blind spot in many organizations and among many leaders on this point. Secrecy as to intentions or results—a whole halo of secrecy—often surrounds the actions of leaders in organizations; the end served by this is seemingly only the enhancement to the leader's self-importance. He alone is in the know! Even where there would be every gain in having intentions, plans and results known by all, leaders ignore the wholesome value of having people properly informed.

Here the leader has a clear duty *to see to it that on all important issues the followers are informed of all relevant facts about new policies as quickly and fully as is practical.*

Rumor thrives on ignorance. And publicity, information and education are the necessary correctives.

Gossip, on the other hand, is inevitable. Our interest in people and in their actions is perennial. But when it becomes malicious and spiteful, it hurts group spirit and must be aggressively attacked. The leader will make it a personal concern to find out the gossiper and help him to understand the error of his ways.

CONCLUSION

The successful leader often shows certain qualities of a good actor. He has a histrionic sense of the best way to dramatize and vitalize ideas so that they are readily communicated to others. In manner and action —in the whole projection of personality—he "puts it over"; he "gets it across." And the process is a

highly dynamic one of much the same kind as projecting an effective stage characterization.

This does not, of course, imply any suggestion of insincerity or posing. But, just as in the theater there is a tradition that "the show must go on" even if the leading actor's wife lies at death's door, so in the leader's relations with his followers, he has an obligation to rise above his momentary moods, to keep their mutual aim consistently to the fore, to keep his bearing and appearance appropriate to his role, to invest his activities with sufficient dignity and to impart a sound glamor and excitement to his project.

The leader should try to develop the capacity to project himself in action with his group so that an effective interrelation is being built up. There should come also the ability to sense when one is not succeeding in this.

To be sure, the initial efforts of individual leaders to follow some of these practical hints may not at first seem spontaneous. Nevertheless, when a new line of behavior is undertaken, proceed confidently and vigorously, and by "going through the act" a new skill will gradually be established which presently may become second nature. This ability to see oneself in action, to put oneself into action in a way to "put it over," can be fostered. But this type of effort requires imagination and conscious study. The leader must deliberately strive to act the leader and to play his part up to the hilt—with verve and conviction!

THE LEADER AS CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN

AS SIMPLE a detail as trying to get a few people to agree about the opening and closing of the windows in a work room can seriously disturb happy working relationships. In one office organization where fifteen or twenty people were dependent upon fresh air from four windows considerable ill feeling developed between those who sat near the windows and wanted them closed because of drafts and those who sat farther away and complained of excessive heat. After some months, when one worker would open a window and another surreptitiously close it as soon as the other's back was turned, the department head decided that something must be done to remove the personal frictions for which the ventilation problem was responsible. He called the entire group together and, after everyone's feeling of grievance had been aired, it was agreed that the room would be thoroughly aired out before the office opened, that window shields would be placed on all the windows to reduce the direct play of air upon those near them and that someone would be made responsible for a complete airing out of the room in the middle of the morning and in the afternoon. Finally, as a further means of having everyone in possession of the facts, several thermometers were purchased and placed in parts of the room both near and away from the windows.

On a basis of the agreement reached in this conference everyone found that his or her comfort was being

more fully considered and the frictions resulting from this particular difficulty were removed.

This was, of course, a relatively minor problem affecting a small number of people. Yet it was able to produce maladjustments out of all proportion to its intrinsic importance. Increase the seriousness of the issue and the size of the group involved, and it is possible to visualize how numerous are the occasions when it is necessary for the leader to take account of the sentiment of a group both in initiating changes and in adjusting difficulties.

Every meeting of a board of directors or trustees, of a board of managers, of an executive committee or a finance committee or a staff conference, reveals differences of outlook and points of view. Every adult-education forum or character-building group discussing religion or philosophy discloses divergent and seemingly irreconcilable convictions.

In all such situations—and they arise at one time or another in practically every group effort—the demand is for a leader who rises above mere headship or nominal chairmanship and facilitates directly *the process of integrated, creative group deliberation.*

It is high time that every organization should realize, especially in a democratic society, that its problems are too complex to be solved by the creative thinking of individuals in isolation. Working as individuals, leaders simply cannot take account of all the facts that will contribute to a right solution of problems involving differences of conviction and opinion within groups.

This is being increasingly recognized to be true. People today show a wholesome disposition to take counsel together. They are anxious for the stimulation of other minds in efforts to hit upon the right idea. They are ready to see if, by a pooling of ideas, some new and

better idea may be evolved. They willingly give careful attention to the ideas of experts of all sorts, while considering, at the same time, their practical consequence.

To whatever field of human endeavor we turn, we find this disposition to reason together multiplying under the stress of need for creating harmonies of attitude, clarity and unity of objectives and practical methods of performance. And in all of this there is no mysterious and incomprehensible "subconscious" necessarily at work to pluck ideas out of the blue. There is, rather, where favorable results obtain, the potent factor of wise leadership—a leadership in which the conscious and known elements in conference success are being studiously allowed to bear fruit.

The conference is not merely an ingenious expedient for the leader. It is far more than that. *The process of conference is the indispensable means of fully grasping the nature of controversial problems, of identifying the controversial factors, of "clearing the air" and of assuring that when any new formula of solution is brought forward it is acceptable to all.*

Hence this process is not automatic or spontaneously productive. It is dependent for its success upon the leader's intelligent use of known techniques. And there has been enough experimentation with these to show the leader how to proceed.

In the sense here used, the word conference does not imply a large meeting before which someone speaks and possibly a few others ask questions at the end. It is a definite coming together of a relatively small group—somewhere between four and forty in number—and in general it will be true that the smaller the group can be and still represent the different points of view which it is important to consider, the more effective the procedure will be. For in the last analysis the basic

purpose of all conference work is to bring understanding, clarification, agreement 'and often the creation of new ideas, out of the interplay of the ideas, emotions and wishes of the participants.

It is well to distinguish the different purposes which a conference can serve, because the leader as chairman will use different methods depending on which objective he has in view.

1. There may be an *informational* conference in which the primary emphasis is upon telling a group with the fullest measure of understanding about a new policy and why it is being put into force. A factory manager, for example, might call together his foremen and set forth the reasons why a horizontal wage cut is going to be put into effect, asking them to return to their departments and explain the situation to their men.

2. Such a conference would be of a *consultative or advisory* character if, after having set forth the need for a wage cut, the manager had asked the foremen's opinion as to when it should take effect or how severe a cut would be accepted by the workers without too serious a protest.

3. The conference would be a *negotiative* one if, instead of the manager's discussing such an issue with his foremen, he had called in a representative works committee and had entered into direct negotiation with them concerning the advisability of a wage cut, whether or not they would assent to it and the amount of reduction which would be accepted.

4. A different objective is seen in the *administrative or coordinative* conference. In this, for example, the several responsible staff heads of an organization

(*e.g.*, sales manager, treasurer, production manager, personnel manager) meet to consider how the selling efforts of the company can be better related to production work to assure steady employment.

5. The conference is also used for a *deliberative or educational* purpose where the objective is a more or less disinterested consideration of ideas on a specific subject. The college seminar, for example, or such gatherings as adult-education groups would fall into this group.

6. Finally, there is the use of the conference for *inspirational* purposes, where the effort is to inspire members with new feelings and new attitudes with a view to affecting the way in which the members will act in the future.

<div align="center">THE LEADER'S PREPARATION</div>

Experience is conclusive that the best conference results are obtained when the leader has supervised all the preparations in advance with the utmost care. Attention has repeatedly been called by other writers to the importance of proper physical surroundings. The question of the selection of the conferees is naturally determined in part by the purpose and scope of the conference. And it can be laid down as a general principle that it will be wise to try to represent the different interests and points of view of all those who will be affected by the outcome of the conference. This principle of the representation of group interests is now widely accepted as sound in those areas of group action which we call political. But it must be admitted that in boards of directors and in administrative bodies generally, organizations have been far too hesitant about making a literal application of this principle. However, if the whole idea of getting channels of

communication adequately established *up from the bottom* as well as *down from the top* is to be given organized expression, this principle of representation of different interests is probably one of the safest guides in the selection of conferees.

The first decision the leader must make, therefore, is regarding the major reason for calling the group together. For upon this decision depends the selection of people to be included in the group and also the extent to which he will go in encouraging group participation in the discussion. We are considering, however, in this chapter those types of conference which are genuinely striving to achieve the fullest possible advance agreement upon a plan of action involving harmony of desires among the conferees. In other words, attention is being centered on consultative, negotiative and coordinative efforts.

It is next important that the leader plan in advance the agenda of matters to be covered and that as far as practical these agenda and any supporting information be supplied in advance to all members of the conference.

Increasingly experience shows that everything which the leader can do beforehand to have the conferees in the right frame of mind will be of the utmost value. The desire to reach an agreement on the part of all members of the group is basic to their success in joint deliberation. And the leader who can develop the right kind of personal relations with and among the members of his group can do much to assure that they come into conference with an attitude of desire to iron out existing difficulties. Everything possible should therefore be done to have the members know each other in a personal way prior to conference deliberations.

Interesting supporting evidence on this point is suggested in Miss Tarbell's "Life of Owen D. Young."[1]

Mr. Young has a well-developed technique for handling negotiation groups, the outcome, of long experience in big and little matters. To avoid premature conclusions, hasty decisions, he keeps the members working in small groups— informal conferences—where they can become acquainted with one another, learn something of how one another's minds work and, most important, learn to trust one another. At the start in Paris he set the members working in small committees on specific questions, himself working now with this group now with that. It was soon apparent that prejudice was breaking down—confidence developing.

Not only must the leader foster the desire to agree, but he must be genuinely anxious to find out what people really mean as contrasted with the words they use or the tone or animus with which they speak. The effort should always be to transcend the level of debate and to discourage any effort on the part of the members merely to "make points" against the rest.

In this connection it is valuable for the leader to appreciate that there are really multiple meanings conveyed when people are communicating together. What is said is by no means all that is imparted by human speech, nor is it necessarily the most important thing imparted. Upon analysis it is found that there is, first, the sense of what is said, that which it refers to and is about. Second, there is the speaker's feeling or attitude toward what he is saying. Third, there is the tone in which it is said—the speaker's attitude toward those he is addressing, his candor, his suspiciousness, satirical or ironic tone or the like. And fourth, there is the speaker's intention—that is, the ultimate effect or result he is trying to secure.[2]

As A. D. Sheffield wisely warns us: •

Discussion evidently requires people to be aware of these complexities of language. Where the subject discussed is simple and objective, the speaker may not need any special

dialectic skill. But few subjects are as simple as at first they seem, and the most rewarding subjects are really opened up only by those who have learned to cut through the sham simplicities, and use the full implications of their own and others' words.

One final preliminary is of great importance, for confusion at this point has caused many conferences to produce disappointing results. *The extent of the power or range of authority granted to the group should usually be explicitly understood* by all its members in advance. It is unfortunate, for example, if a conference reaches agreement on a certain line of action only to find that those in ultimate authority do not agree to and will not accept its decision. Numerous cases have arisen in negotiative conferences in employer-employee relations where a decision on terms of employment was reached, presumably definitive in character, only to be later repudiated either by a board of directors or by the national officers of a labor union. Many heart aches will be avoided if the leader will be completely honest with himself and with his group as to the purpose of the conference and as to the amount of power they have to put into effect whatever decisions may be reached.

LEADING THE MEETING

The process of the conference itself can conceivably have several alternate outcomes. In an informational conference the members may merely submit. In an advisory conference they may acquiesce or assent. In a negotiative conference consent may be given to a specific proposal, or a compromise may be effected. But prevalent though compromise is, it should be realized that ideally it-often leaves much to be desired, because no one interest in the group may feel completely satisfied with the outcome and may be accepting it

with reservations that are almost sure to disturb relationships thereafter and require later adjustments.

To the final alternative result the name *integration* has been applied. By this is meant an agreement which usually represents a new combination of ideas which takes account of and often is an improvement upon the stated wishes of any of the conferees. Integration is essentially a creative process. And although the leader is by no means always the one who formulates the integrated idea, the success of conferences can be much more fully assured if he has sufficient ingenuity and fertility of imagination to be skilled himself in presenting an acceptable new formulation.

Another general point to decide is which one of the three following methods of conducting the discussion the chairman will employ.

He may rely first upon the method of asking questions. Without himself making affirmative statements he may gradually reveal the experiences and opinions of the group by progressive interrogations. With careful selection in advance of the questions to be asked, he may be able to secure some agreement in this way.

The second is the developmental method. It works "by a mixture of questions and affirmations put by the chairman. He decides in advance what the proper solution of the problem is and then guides the group by skillful maneuvers to this conclusion."[3]

Usually the third or discussion method is the one to be preferred as being the soundest process by which genuine agreement is reached. In this method the problem is fully set forth and all divergent experiences and opinions about it are carefully explored in a mood of discovery. "The chairman becomes the teacher who guides the procedure, but not with respect to the end or solution; he stands prepared to abide by the con-

sequences of the conclusion which represents the group, its knowledge and its purpose." Obviously it is this last method which will enable a true integration most effectively to take place.

The further techniques which the leader must employ in his meeting will perhaps be most readily suggested by his asking himself the following questions:

> Does he state the problem fully, fairly and accurately?
> Does he ask pertinent questions which bring out all the facts?
> Does he encourage the statement of all different points of view?
> Does he clarify meanings?
> Does he distinguish and help others to distinguish between conflicts of attitude and misunderstandings of statements?
> Does he try to distinguish between major differences and minor differences which can be more readily disposed of?
> Does he tactfully discourage digressions?
> Does he keep the tone of the meeting impersonal?
> Does he direct the discussion toward the eventual formulation of a solution?
> Does he occasionally summarize the progress of the discussion in a helpful way?
> Does he sense when it is time to cut off discussion and formulate an integrated solution?

Other suggestions in this direction that may be helpful are as follows:[4]

> Try to get out the deeper reasons behind superficially expressed differences. Do not let argument over technical details becloud the main considerations.
> Help the members to do their own best thinking. To "save time" by giving them a better answer to the question may be to waste time as measured by the accomplishment in real growth for the disputants.
> Make sure that the same words are not being used with different meanings.

Do not let the group deceive itself by seeming agreements that are merely vague uncriticized formulas, such as "a fair profit" and "a civilized standard of living."

Get evidence in the most efficient way. If a speaker or lecturer is at hand, use him. If books are ready, use them. If observation and experiment are required, turn to such channels.

The problem with an emotionally charged situation is not to *avert* a frank release of feeling, but to *time* it after the group has established working relations, but before the discussion passes to the concluding stages. Sometimes you may devote a session to a "truth-party," getting out suspicions and resentments which have been impeding the group's progress.

Where a person holds some value with a fixed attitude, as something that "cannot be compromised," do not let the group try to break down his resistance, but draw attention to the need of understanding people's different *tests for truth.*

Be watchful for "digs" and innuendo, especially as to people's *motives.* Protect the speakers from hurts to their self-esteem. Where remarks are being taken personally, put the case as typical of a general situation. This *impersonalizes* the immediate conflict.

If an angry outburst occurs, at once summarise in quiet tones what has been said and draw the reply *to yourself.*

A cautionary word should be spoken about the length of conference sessions. Generally they tend to last too long and a hurried and unsatisfactory effort is made in the last five minutes of the meeting to reach some agreement. The chairman has the major responsibility here for planning the proportion of time given to the analytical as against the creative periods of the discussion. And ordinarily he should try to keep the entire deliberation within an hour and a half, or two hours at most. If the discussion has necessarily to be longer than that, definite provision of a recess or rest period should be made.

Miss Tarbell again cites an illuminating example from the proceedings of the Young Plan Conference in Paris when Mr. Young, as chairman, shrewdly and decisively adjourned a conference at the psychological moment.[5]

> Thus there was [she says] the day when an all-important delegate, angered by a figure which had been presented so much below what he believed his country had a right to expect, so far below what he dared politically to consider, feeling that he had reached the limit of his sacrifice as he had of his patience, sprang from his chair crying, "I'm done, I'm done," and made for the door.
>
> Men who remember Owen Young at St. Lawrence when he led in the struggle to secure a gymnasium, who saw him reorganizing bankrupt public utilities for Texas towns, negotiating labor settlements in the days after the war, who were with him in that Second Industrial Conference or on the Dawes Committee, all tell of the serene, patient, leisurely fashion in which he conducts a deliberating body, but they also tell of an occasional moment when his leisurely mind explodes in a flash of decision.
>
> That was what happened at the moment in the Paris Conference when the outraged delegate started for the door—everybody at the table knowing that if he passed it the conference was at an end.
>
> Owen Young was instantly on his feet. "The committee is adjourned," he said.
>
> It was the committee that went out as a body—went out as if there had been no crucial incident.
>
> He was skillful in anticipating breaking points. There was Dr. Schacht, powerful of mind but at times weak in control. "Whenever I saw Schacht's neck getting red or his hands trembling I adjourned the conference," he will tell you.

The leader should realize that fatigue and wandering attention begin to work against successful conference results after the first hour has passed. And he should try to strike a nice balance between not shutting off

discussion and nevertheless bringing it to a constructive outcome as rapidly as possible.

There will, of course, be numerous instances where conference meetings arouse deep emotions and create unpleasantly tense feelings. A recent writer has pointed out that when a meeting is reaching a point of great tension there is great possible benefit to be obtained by the chairman's tactfully suggesting a moment of silence —a complete pause—in the deliberations. He points out that group members necessarily concentrate attention in the first place on understanding the meaning of what others have said or of framing their own contributions. But it is equally important for each member to understand what the discussion signifies to him personally in terms of his own experience. Over and above everything which can be done to reach agreement upon definitions, each member's own background will still inevitably modify these worded meanings in his own thinking. And if genuine agreements are to be reached, each member must occasionally have time thus to evaluate the total volume of evidence as he himself conceives it.

This is why Mr. Walser makes the following suggestion:[6]

> In discussion, as in daily life, persons and problems oppose us. In both, quick decisions have to be made, often in a few crucial seconds, which carry a train of consequences. Somehow to introduce a stillness and poise into these seconds, lengthening them for this purpose or abandoning the anxiety which colors them, is to touch life at its center. Face to face with a problem that surpasses our powers, discovery of solution frequently comes from momentary abandonment of struggle and care. Tension is reduced and the mind's discord is healed before a new attack. Rhythm and harmony achieve more than mere persistence. When Socrates waited for the promptings of the "demon" within, he was not nursing a

superstition, but a method in thinking reasonably. The best means fail without renewed integration and purification of motive.

To introduce into the discussion the habit of detachment in order to attain the perspective of a larger outlook on life should become a normal and natural step. It may begin by permitting members to stroll out of the room for a short moment or merely to break the sustained concentration. Groups which forget or avoid this may lose the best fruit of discussion, namely the maturing of judgment. Following unbroken succession of talk, the best critical judgment on what was said and done is likely to ripen as one walks home afterward.

Experience has further shown that there are a number of typical behavior traits in conferees which the leader should be able to identify and deal with. Only two or three of the most familiar are mentioned here.

There is always, for example, the member who cannot easily think beyond his own experience. Everyone has encountered the individual who starts out "Now let me tell you my experience," and then proceeds, usually at great length, into an elaborate recital of one particular and often somewhat irrelevant piece of evidence. There are those, also, who are always trying to catch the chairman's eye, because they enjoy being in the limelight or because they have a mistaken sense of duty that those whom they represent expect them to be continuously vocal or because they are genuinely enthusiastic. Every group tends to include those who want to talk too much as well as those who are so shy that they do not talk at all.

Where conference members threaten to lessen the effectiveness of discussion by evidencing such traits, the leader has an important responsibility. And he will find that he can do some of his best work by talking personally to such individuals between conferences.

For any effort in the meeting itself which gives the effect of rebuking members,' however gently, is almost sure to have a chilling result upon the whole atmosphere.

Finally, a question will arise as to the precise method by which the decision of the group is to be registered. Obviously in a board of directors and in certain other types of formal negotiative conference, an actual record vote may be required. But where this is not the case and where the chairman is skillful in helping the group to arrive at an integrated solution, there is usually much to be said in favor of having conclusions arrived at and summarized as the "sense of the meeting," rather than by an actual show of hands.

In conclusion, it should be repeated that the successful use of conferences depends on the skill of the leader. Now that conferences are coming to be recognized as the psychologically sound means of group communication they are, the wise leader will be at pains to acquire an effective technique as conference chairman.

PROBLEMS OF THE ASSISTANT LEADER

THE following letter was received by the writer some months ago from the executive supervisor of a district nursing local unit:

> I would be interested [she writes] to have your ideas regarding the place and duties of an assistant in an office, preferably a business organization, to see how it lines up with my theories regarding the duties of an assistant in a branch nursing office.
>
> To me, an assistant supervisor has been one to whom you entrust certain responsibilities which you know she is perfectly capable of carrying out. I then add to these little by little as she becomes more familiar with the duties and policies of the organization and as I am sure of the way she responds to different situations. But at all times the supervisor is the responsible person, and if with the duties assigned, a new policy has to be decided on, the assistant consults the supervisor; and if the two cannot come to a decision that is satisfactory to the assistant, the assistant then has the privilege of carrying it to the main office. Office affairs ought always be discussed in advance with the supervisor and policies not changed unless the supervisor has an opportunity to hear of the proposed changes. Of course, emergencies always have to be handled as such.
>
> Our assistants are appointed from the staff so they have the general policies well learned but the policies regarding supervision and administering an office have to be taught. To me, the good assistant has been one who handles the situations wisely, one in whose judgment I have confidence and one who does not neglect to report the developments and interesting facts that develop in the day's routine so that I am not embarrassed when asked for information on affairs of the office by the head executives.

These theories have always worked until recently when I found my assistant making decided changes in policies without consulting me, and feeling badly abused because she hasn't all the duties of a supervisor. Of course, the depression has caused a lot of discontent because many of us supervisors do not feel like giving up our positions to try to get other posts because of the uncertainty of economic conditions. This leaves the assistants discontented as they have held their positions capably two or three years and there isn't much hope for advancement for an indefinite future.

This letter calls attention to a problem which is likely to exist in one form or another in every organization where an executive leader shares some responsibilities with an assistant. Such assistants may be as high in estate as vice-presidents of huge corporations or they may be secretarial aids upon whom the leader relies for help with countless details. But in some form and with some title the assistant leader is to be found in many groups and at many levels. And his or her relation to the leader and to the rest of the organization calls for special thoughtfulness.

In fact, so frequent is the use of both men and women secretaries today to absorb many duties of the assistant leader, that it is important to remind both leaders and secretaries to whom really large powers are delegated that the *avowed* status of such workers should be consistent with the facts. Many positions which are nominally secretarial are in fact those of an executive assistant. Indeed, one major difficulty in every such relationship of leader and assistant is always to obtain a clear recognition throughout the organization as to what grant of authority has been made to the assistant.

Admittedly there has been little intimate study of the subtleties of this interrelation; and for this reason it is easier to diagnose the problem than to prescribe exactly how to handle it. It exists, however, from the

two different points of view—that of the leader and of the assistant. And it will be useful to mention some of the typical difficulties that each one may face.

One of the most prevalent complaints of leaders is that suggested in the letter quoted above that assistants often tend to usurp too much authority and take too much into their own hands. In a sense this is a praise-worthy fault, however annoying it may prove in detail. The leader's effort to correct this difficulty requires candid analysis to see whether the trouble comes from too much ambition and assertiveness on the assistant's part, or whether—which is frequent—there has been no clear definition and division of duties laid down by the leader himself.

In general the need is for a careful job analysis of the assistant's function and for an explicit delegation of duties and authority which is clear to the assistant and *equally clear to those working under both of them.* Confusion frequently arises because members of a group find that the assistant has given orders which the leader presently changes. Resentment also occurs when the assistant has become so experienced that he is competent to take over much of the leader's work if only he had the chance.

While every such relationship has to be handled individually it remains broadly true that the situation will be eased if the leader sees the differentiation of tasks in the following terms. The assistant should handle such matters as the details of supervision, the initial records of work assignment and progress, the over-sight of training of new members or the necessary re-training of others. The leader should hold for himself the role of stimulator, coordinator and adjuster.

He should try to keep himself free to handle dealings with other related groups (as with other departments in a business organization), to study improvements and economies, to bind the group members together in a sense of enthusiastic unity.

If some such broad division of effort as this can be agreed upon, a useful dovetailing of labors will result.

Then there is the assistant who is always trying to justify himself too insistently with his superior because he is not sure of himself. This may lead to that unpleasant manifestation popularly known as boot-licking, or to boasting or to a bullying of others.

This is not an easy condition to correct. It may be due to youth, to inexperience or to lack of technical grasp. But whatever the cause the way to improvement lies in thoughtful, personal coaching by the leader. If he has the needed training sense he can bring such an assistant through a truly constructive apprenticeship.

There will be cases, however, where the assistant tries to curry favor with his chief because he believes —rightly or wrongly—that the superior is a "glutton for glory" and wants adulation and subservience. Where a leader is honest enough with himself to recognize that he may be seeking and enjoying more personal praise than is merited, the way to correction is obvious. But where the leader is really at fault in this particular and does not know it, a problem exists which has ultimately to be coped with by the leaders of higher rank.

Again, there is the leader who is conspicuously younger than those whom he is leading, including his assistant. This widely met fact results usually from real superiorities of capacity—technical, executive or leading—possessed by the younger man. And it is a relationship, therefore, which calls for special thought-

fulness on his part. He should have it brought home
to him by some older leader that he cannot wisely
judge others by himself. For his very success as a
leader despite his youth is due to a degree of drive,
intelligence and persistence which is greater than
average. To be successful he has, therefore, to acquire
real sympathy with the slower tempo, lesser ambition
and reduced energy of the older people working under
him.

His competence should, of course, be unquestioned;
yet he must show it in action modestly and patiently.
He will get farther if he takes counsel with his assistant
and his group more often than an older leader might;
and he should be especially careful about the detailed
manners of his personal contacts as suggested in an
earlier chapter.

Finally, there is the occasional situation where a
woman leader has a man assistant. This is not an easy
position for either to be in. Presumably the woman has
been advanced because of unusual capabilities. If she
is to be secure and confident in her position this su-
periority should be uncontestable and readily ac-
knowledged by her assistant and the group. If to
her qualities of leadership she can add that quality of
personal friendliness and human directness which are
commonly thought of as feminine characteristics, her
problem will be greatly lessened.

Upon this point a wise and successful woman execu-
tive has written:

> There is almost always a strong masculine protest when a
> woman has men working under her. They tend to resent
> her authority and want to be independent of her supervision.
> Only the other day I encountered this again, where the
> senior doctor in a clinic—a most competent woman—was
> having difficulties with one of the junior men physicians

There is a solution. If the woman will be generous, will help to develop her subordinates, give them plenty of opportunity for self-expression and let them of their own accord come to acknowledge her skill and fitness for her job, the situation can be much appeased. What successful woman has not again and again allowed her men co-workers to think that their ideas were original, though she knew they had originated with her.

The woman leader, must, of course, have the wholehearted support of the rest of the upper executive group, and if it is recognized among her own subordinates that she has this backing her work within her own realm will be further lightened. Generally speaking, if she *knows the job and does it conspicuously well,* she will not experience serious difficulty. But if she does have trouble with her assistant or a few group members who resent her success, the answer may lie in a few judicious transfers so that individuals too stubborn or too old to change their views toward women leaders are replaced by others more flexibly minded.

THE ASSISTANT LOOKS AT THE LEADER

In the strains and stresses between leader and assistant it is by no means always true that it is the latter who is at fault. The testimony of assistant department heads is abundantly to the effect that the leaders themselves sometimes make cooperation difficult. And as more first-hand study is given to this phase of the problem, the ways of coping with it will undoubtedly become better understood.

First, there is the problem of the assistant who *knows* that he is better qualified than the leader. Other factors than merit get people into leading positions. Nepotism, favoritism, an impressive front, a smooth line of talk—these are all at work in organizations of all

kinds to advance those who may be really deficient in leadership capacity. Often this is known by the group members just as well as it is by the assistant. "He's just a stuffed shirt; but his sister married the treasurer of the company and of course he got the job as head of our department. And Jack Bates, his assistant, does all the work." This kind of comment is all too familiar.

How are the Jack Bateses of the world to deal with their leaders? Are they to cover up their deficiencies? Are they to pretend to ignore them? Are they to urge the rest of the group to be loyal to such persons? Are they to remain in the background and let the nominal leader get all the credit?

These are hard questions. And certainly no answer can be made to them which would correctly satisfy every case. It remains true that *in the long run* the limitations of such so-called leaders usually are acknowledged by those in ultimate authority; and sometimes changes are made when the facts are known. But meanwhile a thoroughly capable and ambitious assistant may be fretting and preparing to resign from the organization because he feels his progress is blocked and his merits are unappreciated.

Loyalty to one's chief in cases of this kind must certainly be qualified. It is asking too much of human nature for it to be otherwise. Sometimes it is possible to make it judiciously known to those higher up that one would value the chance of any available promotion to some other section of the organization.

Usually the capable assistant owes it to himself in such instances to try to be sure that in some way his worthy record is known by those who can do something about it. Within his own group it will on the whole be injudicious to make it known that he doubts his leader's competence. The working unity of the organiza-

tion as a whole usually demands at least a nominal acceptance of the outward amenities of an attitude of confidence in the leader. If an assistant cannot go this far, his situation is all but intolerable, and he should consider carefully whether he should resign. It may be that, if the evidence of the leader's incompetence is too glaring and the results of it seriously hurtful to the organization, the assistant should place the facts frankly and quietly before those higher up. But he must be sure of his ground and be as impersonal as possible in his appraisal of the situation. Such a going over the head of his immediate leader is always hazardous.

There is, also, the problem of the assistant—especially in times of economic slump—who finds his progress too slow, because all the posts above him are occupied by those who will no doubt serve the organization for years to come. Where this is the case the assistant may well talk the problem frankly over with the leader, assuming he has confidence in the latter's judgment and discretion. For it is always possible that the assistant himself may be the victim of limitations of which he is unaware, and which may be the reason for his failure to get promotion. Where conference with the leader reveals that failure to get advancement is caused by shortcomings which can be identified and analyzed, the way to correct these can often be suggested at the same time and a program of correction outlined.

M. J. Ream[1] cites the following incident which well illustrates this sort of problem:

> "I entered this office as a clerk fifteen years ago. Today I am still a clerk. I feel sure my work is satisfactory because I am never called down. But if there is something wrong with me, I want to know what it is, because I want to get ahead."

How many times this plea for advancement is made in every large office!

In this particular case, the boss was quite sympathetic, and asked, "Have you a suggestion as to how we might use you in a more important way?"

The clerk was ready.

"I should like to be made a Section Head responsible for getting ready the figures on which the weekly reports are based. I would need three clerks as assistants who would be under my authority."

But in assigning clerks to the new section trouble began. The ambitious clerk protested: "Oh, I could not use Miss Brown."

"Why? Is she not capable?"

"Yes, she is capable, but she is so stubborn. If I point out a mistake she has made, she always gets sore. And, too, I would rather have someone else than Miss Crane. She does not think this recording amounts to much. She would rather do checking."

The chief's answer was, "The reason for your lack of advancement is quite clear to me now. The trouble is with you. If you ever hope to be an executive of any kind, you will have to learn the trick of stimulating other people and getting them to do willingly the work you assign."

Try to get an intelligent and honest estimate of your probable capacities as a leader—is, therefore, the first advice to offer to the assistant who is disappointed with his failure to get ahead.

But there will be plenty of assistants who suffer from no serious shortcomings, whose slowness of advancement may be due either to special conditions within the organization or to the general economic outlook. If the former is the case, and the positions higher up are all filled by relatively young men, the assistant should frankly face this fact and consider whether he might do better elsewhere.

If analysis shows that business conditions make advancements unlikely anywhere, then the best counsel

to the assistant is one of patience. Let him continue to prepare himself for a leading post, let him study and make a good record, and be ready for whatever offers when the time comes.

Sometimes, also, he can get advancement by an increase in salary even if his status has to remain the same. There is no reason, especially in organizations which are hard-boiled on the whole subject of salaries, why the assistant should not look elsewhere for an offer of higher pay which can be used as a lever to get his pay raised where he is. This is not only ethically defensible but highly desirable if the rate of pay is relatively low and the man's working record thoroughly satisfactory. For there should be a recognized obligation upon organizations to adopt a payment policy for executives which will take some account of length of tenure as well as of the kind of work done.

A final point making for harmony in the working together of assistant and leader is the obverse of one mentioned earlier. Where it is not set forth to him by the leader, the assistant may well ask for an explicit statement of the range of his authority, which should be conveyed also to all members of the working group. His executive effectiveness will be increased by this as well as his prestige in the eyes of the group. Emphasis in such a request should be upon the definiteness of the assignment, rather than on any suggestion of its widened scope. As one assistant said, "I'd like to know where I get off with the men when I go round in the department."

An upstanding young leader who was acting as the personal assistant to the president of a large organization tells an incident that is related to this kind of problem. Early in her employment there was placed on her desk a memorandum which had evidently gone

to several executives and which began as follows. "It is hereby ordered that . . . " She read the order and found it called for a procedure which she did not believe in. She straightway went into the president's office and said: "Do I have to do this? I don't believe in it! I've never been ordered to do anything in my life and it seems to me I should have had a chance to express an opinion on this. . . . " And she went on to tell why she felt the order was unwise. The result of this conversation was the creation of an executive conference group which thereafter conferred regarding all orders to be issued and which rephrased them into less peremptory terms.

Here was an assistant leader who by the exercise of a little courage and constructive intelligence was able to improve the basic working relations of an entire executive group.

WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THE ASSISTANT LEADER?

In the light of these brief intimations of the kinds of difficulties which arise between leaders and assistants, it may be useful to suggest in positive terms what the ideal relationship might be. Against this as a measuring rod it should be possible to see where in any particular case the existing contacts fall short. In summary, the successful assistant leader should:

1. Have confidence and faith in the leader. He should be loyal to him and enthusiastic on behalf of the aim he is trying to realize.

2. Interpret the leader to the organization and the organization to the leader, reenforcing the leader at every possible point. Specifically this may involve: (a) acting as a go-between; (b) keeping his ear to the ground for unfounded rumors; (c) sounding out members for direct reactions and sentiments; (d) gauging

how and when the leader should make special presentations of information or appeals for more support; (e) helping to inculcate group aims and to personalize the leader's relations in his followers; (f) suggesting new ways and means for better realizing the objectives.

3. Economize the time and strength of the leader by: (a) acting as a buffer to protect his chief from unnecessary demands (which requires, of course, that some genuine authority be delegated); (b) facilitating the flow of performance in every possible way; (c) supplying the leader with all necessary records which are indices of performance and of morale, as well as making reports and digests of relevant facts.

In short, that assistant will be the best who is in a real sense something of *a leader himself in his own right.* There will be cases where the assistant does not expect or desire to be elevated eventually to a full leadership position. But where, as is more usually the case, the post is explicitly one which holds out the chance to rise, the assistant should be chosen and his work laid out so that *he is continuously by way of becoming more and more of a leader.* This should be to the front in his own mind, in that of his leader and in that of the organization as a whole.

If, as already said, the assistant has, however, important reservations about the soundness of his loyalty to the leader or to his cause, he should honestly confront the fact. He should decide whether, all things considered, these reservations are so serious that they make him unfit to do his job well, and he should act accordingly.

In the last analysis, the soundness of the assistant's relation to the leader depends in good part upon the leader. If he is acting as a leader should, if he is adopting a teaching attitude toward his assistant and is not

obsessed with pride of place, he should be able to facilitate any personal adjustments which the situation requires. He cannot, of course, work himself out of his own position—unless he deliberately wishes to; nor can he create for ambitious subordinates advanced positions for which the organization has no need. But within the frame of these often inevitable limitations the leader should assume as one of his major responsibilities the development of a productive working relation with his assistant. He should try to supplement his own efforts and resources with those of his helpers, so that together they make as strong a team as possible.

THE HAZARDS OF LEADERSHIP

HE'S got a swelled head." "He drives himself but he drives others more." "He won't listen to advice." "If you want to get on with him, you have to tell him what a big shot he is and agree with all he says." "He's got women on the brain." "He tries to make everyone scared to death of him." "When he gets mad, keep out of his way." "When he doesn't say 'good morning' when he comes in, we know it's likely to be a bad day."

These are but a few of the remarks which everyone who has worked in organized groups has overheard or has made at one time or another about some executive leader. They indicate that leaders are studied by their followers more closely than may be realized. But, more important, they suggest that when people are in a position to exercise power over others, certain dangers are likely to creep in. And even though the leader may have his power with the full awareness and consent of his group, it is possible for him to overreach himself to the detriment of his own influence and to the point of being harmful to his followers.

Any peculiarities of his which make him become too self-centered and allow him to exploit his peculiarities for his own personal satisfaction will easily endanger the whole leadership relation. If he is mentally unbalanced, is suffering from some obsession, is compensating for his shortcomings in odd or perverted ways or is the victim of unwholesome habits, he is a potential menace.

But cases of pathological abnormality are admittedly less frequent than cases of exaggeration of some normal characteristic which distorts behavior and thus raises barriers to the leader's influence. Both degrees of difficulty will here be considered. The aim will be to identify the more frequently met manifestations of personality disturbance, as well as to suggest some of the more extreme maladjustments. It may then be possible to present in general terms the approach to corrective measures for the individual himself or for those who wish to help him.

The importance of concerning ourselves with the hazards which personality aberrations in the leader can create will be appreciated if we recall the two assumptions underlying this volume. In the first place, leaders should properly regard other people as *ends in themselves*, not as mere instruments for realizing ends imposed by a leader. And any traits which make the leader unduly self-regarding, overly aggressive or ruthless naturally tend to make him attach undue importance to his own personal satisfactions. Secondly, it may reasonably be assumed that the normal, healthy-minded person will naturally be inclined to exercise power by persuasive influence rather than by coercing, bullying or arbitrary bossing. Bossing in its various forms is the ego principle on a rampage.

Also we should not forget that leadership, even at a minor level, may involve so great a relative strength of certain assertive traits that the situation invites temptations to an exaggerated expression of those traits. And that way lies danger!

It may be objected, however, that mental balance is not to be expected of leaders because those qualities which have made them leaders typically imply an undue ascendancy of certain special traits. Certainly it would

be easy to point to specific leaders and claim that their power seems due to their making virtues of their vices, to their capitalizing on certain traits they possess in excess, or to the dominating power of their obvious fixations.

But from the point of view of the individual looking at himself and his own development for leadership fitness, no less than from the point of view of the organization seeking to obtain for itself leaders with the greatest promise of success, it is fair to point out that these exaggerated traits are potential hazards at best. A more normal balance is presumably a condition to be encouraged.

The very idea of mental normality is, as the psychiatrists point out, an arbitrary one. But it stands nevertheless for some reality of working balance and adjustment of conflicting traits in the personality which it is sound to strive for. It is a sounder aim than to ignore a distorted development of disagreeable traits or tacitly to assume that the leader has to be allowed to foster his peculiarities as intrinsic to his success as a leader. The soundly integrated personality promises to exercise a control and direction of behavior which yields superior results in dealing with other human beings.

What we are especially concerned with here are all those departures from normal which vitiate a right attitude and give rise to domineering behavior. It will be useful to suggest the typical sources of the various kinds of mental or emotional disturbance which may jeopardize the leadership relation. The following classification is practical rather than scientific, designed only to give a clue for purposes of identification.

There are, first, those personality disturbances of preponderantly physical origin, due largely to organic

afflictions, weaknesses or defects. This would include, for example, such varied causes as unusually short stature, glandular imbalance, low blood pressure, any specific inferiority of an organ or excessive bodily fatigue due to organic defects.

Second, there are the disturbances due to functional or psychical causes where no actual physical or bodily defect is present. These would include fixations or complexes, often infantile in origin, and therefore long since forgotten by the individual, which rise up to plague him. These may have their origin in early shocks of fear, in sexual attachments or experiences that were repressed as being contrary to conventional standards, in feelings of inferiority due to environmental factors, in delusions of persecution.

At the less pathological level these causes might include extreme jealousy, excessive worry or anxiety, unsatisfied ambitions and maladjustments of domestic or of personal sexual relations.

How, then, do these various causes and occasions of mental disturbances show themselves in action which is hazardous to the leader's relation to his followers?

The manifestations which seem most important as bearing on this problem are the following:

Love of power.

Emotional instability.

Obsessive fears.

Inferiority feelings.

Tendency to rationalize.

Sexual frustrations and maladjustments.

Sadistic tendencies.

LOVE OF POWER

The desire for enhancement of the essential ego of every individual is one of his central driving motives—

one which colors and influences all behavior, and one which is, of course, natural and essential. All of us have to register, to stand well in our own eyes, to attain a sense of individual worthwhileness. The leader naturally gets an exceptional opportunity to satisfy this urge through his exercise of leadership. But this love of self-enhancement can easily get out of hand; and if the leadership situation becomes, as it well may, the sole channel for the release of the will to power, the dangers of excess are real.

This excess may take several forms. The leader may consciously enjoy a feeling of superiority and aloofness, showing itself in condescension, vanity, conceit and self-pride. He may demand too much adulation and personal loyalty, and therefore try to surround himself with sycophants, "yes-men" and "rubber stamps." He may want his own way too much and too often, and be too opinionated and obstinate about taking counsel with his colleagues and followers. Everyone is familiar with individuals who, elevated to posts of leadership opportunity, show these characteristics to a greater or lesser degree.

The leader may take everything too personally— both praise and blame—identifying himself too closely with his objective. This, indeed, seems to be a danger to which women leaders are especially exposed. Their followers, especially other women, often feel that they demand an undue personal loyalty and devotion, and that they harbor a long resentment against followers who differ with them.

Feelings of jealousy toward others who may aspire to rise to the status of a leader are also encountered as subtle evidences of a desire to have self-power remain unquestioned. This tendency is characteristic of both sexes and is to be noted in many organizations. Why

it may present a special difficulty for women leaders
will be considered in the next chapter.

What can be done in such cases?

The first question to put is: Why is the individual
so ruthlessly projecting his ego through his leadership
setting? Is it due to an effort to compensate for feelings
of inferiority, for a repressed childhood and thwarted
upbringing, for a domestic setting which is unsatisfying?
Is it due to a too rapid advancement?

Understanding of the cause is essential to correction
and in some way a consciousness of the difficulty has
to be brought home to the leader himself. Only partially
can this be done in terms of an intellectual appeal.
The root causes go deeper into his emotions and basic,
non-rational desires. Until these causes are disclosed
little can be done.

Sometimes a realization of the trouble may dawn
on the leader when he comes a cropper, when his con-
stituents turn against him, when (in industrial life)
they go out on strike, when (in politics) they fail to
reelect him, when (in a labor union) they secede and
form another body. In such cases the logic of events
may lead him to a confronting of reality—to an admis-
sion that his relations with the led are no longer happy
and thus to a self-questioning as to where the fault
lies.

Sometimes the candid friend or kindly adviser may
be able to bring home to the leader the fact that his
will to power has come to be his undoing. In some way
he has eventually to become conscious of the fault;
and by taking counsel he has to lay bare the causes or
reasons why the fault has grown. These have, of course,
to be coped with. It would be impossible here to re-
hearse the corrective steps that can be taken in the
individual case.

There are, however, one or two general observations which can be offered. Sometimes it may be useful for the leader deliberately to widen his range of active interests so that his will to power can find expression in more than one direction or outlet. The too assertive leader who says that his work is his whole life may profitably find that the *development of an avocation or hobby* can help relieve the emotional tension of his leadership effort, can give him a saner outlook and wider perspective, can give vent to his excess energy in ways that do not tempt him to overdo his leadership zeal.

In a wholly different direction, it is often true in large groups that the leader has no *organized channel of constant communication* with his followers. He may have no opportunity to learn vividly what the followers' reactions to him and his will to power are until it is too late. This argues for the deliberate creation of explicit, organized methods of joint conference with typical representatives of the group, in the course of which the mirror will almost inevitably be held up to nature and egregious defects of a heightened ego will tend to become known to the leader. One of the psychological justifications for representative institutions, not alone in civic affairs but in all the other organized, institutional relations of society, is that the representatives of the led can, if they will, put a check upon the leader's will to power and keep him continuously aware of *their* desires and rights.

On the preventive side, it is not unlikely that help on this score can be offered to younger leaders in their training and apprentice period. To a certain extent it can sometimes be successfully brought to more practiced leaders. There is the need of instilling the truth, already elaborated, that there is a profound sense in which *the leader is the servant of the followers.*

There will also be cases where an offensive display of superiority will be due to relatively obscure causes, where it is an effort to compensate for a deeply felt sense of inadequacy or failure to achieve in some other part of one's nature. Our understanding today of this tendency to compensate and to make an exaggerated effort to appear to be something we are not, can prove most helpful here. A variety of maladjustments can be interpreted in the light of this tendency. Here, for example, is an executive who, as an only child brought up in a wealthy family and educated among other boys who were accustomed to command whatever money could buy, dominates and bosses in a most objectionable way, after having had to submit to several years of subordination while learning the business as a minor employee. Here is a man of short stature, with weak, thin voice and unprepossessing manner, who becomes a bullying, arbitrary manager with a bitterly sarcastic tongue. Here is a man of mild disposition who is married to a strong-willed, domineering wife who completely runs his outside life; in consequence he compensates by unduly arrogant, aggressive and assertive behavior in his work relations. Here is the youngest son of a family of six children who was babied and bossed at home; he too compensates for his repressed childhood by excessively domineering behavior. Here is an executive of foreign birth, of marked foreign cast of countenance, with a pronounced foreign accent, with no so-called family or social standing and little formal education. In action with his associates to whom he may feel inferior, he may try to offset this feeling by being offensively aggressive or "know-it-all."

Examples of this general type could be multiplied by the score and are familiar in the experience of every large organization. They have first to be recognized for

what they are—abnormal reactions to a whole set of circumstances which are unfortunate for the individual. And the individual himself in one way or another has, if any change is to come, to be brought to a realization of just what he is doing, and why. The cause or source of his trouble has to be revealed to the person himself. Broadly speaking, it is necessary that the individual's ego be enabled to express itself in ways that will not hurt others or his relation with others. If there must be compensations for deficiencies that cannot themselves be changed, the vital effort should be to remove such compensatory behavior as much as possible from the area of action where leadership has to be exercised.

EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY

The dangers of explosions of anger have already been emphasized. And there are other emotional evidences of instability to be guarded against. There are, for example, chronic irritability, quick temper, grouchiness and moodiness, yielding to what to the observer seem unaccountable shifts from elation and cheerfulness to depression, sullenness and despair. This last in an extreme form becomes pathological and is known as a "manic-depressive" condition requiring the most expert care.

There is also an emotional impulse to be ceaselessly and nervously active—an excess of sheer busyness—accompanied by an inability to concentrate long on any task. This jumpy tendency may for some time appear to the observer as an evidence of great drive; but where it means a failure to focus and to finish—a capacity to start numerous lines of activity which are as promptly dropped—this is likely to be an evidence of an instability which needs watching.

The causes of such manifestations may be many
and various; but causes there are. Such evidences of
instability are *not* normal, do not have to be endured
as innate, are danger signals and symptoms of deeper
maladjustments, physical or mental, which need to be
laid bare. More often than we suspect, the origins of
these states are organic—are due to a variety of diges-
tive difficulties, to glandular disturbances, to sexual
frustrations, to the aging of the organism, to fatigue.
They may be caused by worrying or be due to deeper
psychic maladjustments. But diagnosed they must be
if the followers are not to have to endure the caprices
to which such emotional excesses give rise.

A distinction has, however, to be observed between
instability which is directed objectionably because
arbitrarily against *people*, against those being led, and
that mobilization of passion on behalf of a cause held
sacred—which may come to appear to be lack of emo-
tional balance. In this latter sense, it is not certain
that stability is to be expected or even desired. There
should, of course, be checks of judgment and of a sense
of proportion upon any leader. But he may be expected,
at the higher levels of leadership, to be highly charged
emotionally and virtually obsessed by what he is
trying to do. His zeal is the essence of his effectiveness.
And within the limits of recognizable sanity, he will
naturally be emotionally borne up by his enthusiasm.
In this sense his instability may be his strength.

OBSESSIVE FEARS

We know to-day that fears, often unacknowledged
by the individual, may play a devastating role in impair-
ing effective human relations. And although it may
seem odd that the one who leads may sometimes be

afraid, this is undoubtedly the case. Let us examine some of the fears which he may experience.

In the first place, he may be afraid he is not good enough for his task, is not qualified for it and may be on the point of ignominious failure. He may suffer from awareness that in education, social background, personal appearance, *savoir faire* or popularity among his followers, he is not the equal of his associates. He may be afraid that his position is insecure, due to his failure to please either those above or below him in rank. In an acute form this state of mind can become a persecution complex which believes that others are plotting his undoing and spying out his failures. Cases of jealousy of other men who seem to be getting greater recognition may be a special form of fear.

All such emotions naturally undermine self-confidence; they tend to center attention on the feared thing; they curb enthusiasm. They are an inhibiting and repressive force which tends to destroy the sources of personal power. Usually they are exaggerated and unwarranted, and are an indication that the individual is not squarely facing realities.

Such an individual needs to answer the question: What am I afraid of and why? Honest facing of this question often discloses the unreality of the source of the fear. Or, if it is more deeply grounded, this effort to get at the cause may encourage the individual to see what he can do to remove the causes of fixations which the fear has brought to light.

The following are illustrations at two different levels of experience which emphasize the importance of the harmful role which fear can play. One is simple and more or less typical. When the superintendent of a factory was transferred to another position, it was decided by the management at the central office that the

assistant superintendent was not to be advanced; and without any word of explanation to him a new superintendent was brought in from the outside. The effect of this on the assistant was most adverse. He worried; he lost weight; he was afraid he was about to be discharged; he tried to cooperate with the new head but was sure he was not making good with him. His whole working effectiveness was noticeably diminished. After six months and quite by chance, one of the executives from the company's central office came to the plant and had a chat with the assistant. In the course of this it came out that the management had all along been grooming the assistant for the position of superintendent of another unit at the beginning of the next year. The effect of this information was electric in bringing a new sense of self-assurance. The man breathed a deep sigh of relief and went back to his job with all his inhibiting fears at once sloughed off and his old energy and interest restored.

The other instance is certainly not typical but it shows how forgotten shocks and fears can on occasion have a demoralizing influence. This was the case of a man who in middle life developed an obsession that in any meeting place he must sit near the exit. He came to make it a definite practice always to sit near the door in any gathering of people. Finally a business convention required that he make a speech on the stage of a local theater. When he arose to speak a terror took possession of him; he felt trapped and looked around for the exit in an agonized way; he ran off the stage and out into the street. That this was not simply stage fright was so evident to him that he presently sought the aid of a psychiatrist. Eventually the cause of his peculiar disturbance was unfolded. He was helped to recall that as a child he had once been locked

in a closet as a punishment and that a rat had attacked him there in the dark to his infinite terror. The mark of this terrific shock had been left long after the incident was forgotten, and his fear of being confined had come to assume pathological proportions. When, however, his infantile experience was brought to light and was fully understood, the obsessive behavior ceased.

Persecution complexes are sufficiently frequent to deserve a special word. Usually they are the result of a distraught state of mind which, in the individual's effort at release and adjustment, tends to fix on some aspect of the immediate situation. An individual thus afflicted, for example, may see two associates conferring together and decide they are discussing him and criticizing him or plotting against him. Someone fails to answer his polite "Good morning," or some other combination of accidental circumstances may feed his suspicion that he is being persecuted. The trouble here is more often in the subjective condition of the individual (which must be diagnosed) than it is in the objective facts upon which he is projecting his disturbance.

For example, take the case of a department executive in a company who after many years of loyal service had found he was not getting the advancement he expected and desired. More or less consciously he began to slight his duties and become critical of other executives. And quite unconsciously he began to believe that one particular man was being distinctly disloyal to the company and was trying in every possible way to get his own job. Indeed, so convinced did he become of this that he went to his own superior officer with a long story of criticisms of his supposed persecutor; only after extended conversations did the entire picture of the motives at work here come out into the open.

In this case the individual not only came to believe that he was being persecuted, but he projected upon and imputed to the persecutor his own attitude of disloyalty. This illustrates what is often true, that the feeling of being persecuted is due to some shortcoming which the individual is reluctant to acknowledge. And the resulting sense of unhappiness or frustration is rationalized and temporarily adjusted away by the building up of a whole false fabric of ideas that others are to blame.

INFERIORITY FEELINGS

A professor was approached by the president of his university with the request that he take over the administrative work of the dean of summer session. The professor had no experience with executive work and had a real misgiving as to whether he was qualified for it. Finally the president said, "Professor Blank, we all make mistakes. I make mistakes and so will you. I shall expect this. But I am confident that you will do a good job and I will support your efforts in every way." Something in the quiet reassurance of these remarks strengthened the professor's faith in himself and he presently acquiesced and did splendidly as dean.

Many organizations could point to good workers just below the level of executive leadership who seem qualified to lead but are afraid to try. Their feeling of inferiority seems to be too strong for them. The sources of such a feeling may be complex but they can sometimes be removed by careful efforts. And when an individual seems able to assume a leadership post but refuses to make the effort, it is often worth while for the trainer of leaders to attempt to help him over the hurdle. Merely to pass over the individual who says he

does not want such advancement is too easy. It is necessary to try to discover why he refuses larger responsibilities, and to be sure that he is not rationalizing some unwarranted feeling of inferiority.

The crucial requirement is a restoration of self-confidence. The reassurance which success in action gives can often work further wonders in rapidly building up self-esteem and effectiveness in such people. If there can be careful, close coaching by the trainer for a period of weeks after a man has been advanced into a new post, and if he can get a taste of success in carrying on as a leader—he can frequently be freed of his inferiority feeling.

TENDENCY TO RATIONALIZE

By the tendency to rationalize is meant an extreme degree of the common failing to do what we want and later seek some reason why we did it; or not to do something for reasons which are subsequently formulated. This familiar fact becomes serious when it allows the individual to fool himself into thinking he has made a satisfactory adjustment to realities, whereas in fact he has become blind to important consequences or has left the causes of a situation unaffected and uncorrected by his rationalizing effort. Rationalizing in its extreme forms means that the individual convinces himself that he is in normal relations to others when all the while they may be aware that something is radically wrong with him.

A number of instances arose in connection with a consulting practice in New England where in certain antiquated factory buildings were found working conditions exceedingly adverse to health and operating efficiency. Every recommendation for improvement

was met by the executives' response that they did not wish to spend money in this way because presently they were going to build a new plant. That was over ten years ago and those new plants have still to be constructed!

Countless instances of this kind of illogical excuse will come to everyone's mind. One case involved a hospital superintendent who refused to make any effort to consult with her laundry workers about the rising costs of laundry operation because, she said, "They don't know anything anyway and that class never will." What she meant was that she was too lazy or too timid to make any attempt to inform them, especially since the head of the laundry was a foul-mouthed but competent woman of whom she was afraid. The president of a corporation was once asked why his company gave its top executives only the same two-weeks annual vacation which all office employees received. "Oh," he said, "it's impossible to define who are the top executives." But he himself took a full month off each year.

There are several practical implications of this tendency in action which it is helpful to note. For one thing it fosters a deliberate willingness to ignore important facts in a situation when decisions are being reached. For it means that the leader gets an idea of what he wants and then uses the evidence convenient to support his more or less impulsive wish. It fosters also a tendency to blame others for failures for which the leader should shoulder the blame.

Executive leaders are not always as careful as they might be to state explicitly the amount of authority or responsibility they are delegating to others, because they have found this leaves them freer to attach blame if a job is not accomplished as expected. This

same trait accounts for the reluctance of some executives to reduce decisions of contract or of policy to writing. This becomes too specific and definite for them and leaves no room for rationalized interpretations they may later desire to make in an effort to change their decisions or place blame for failures.

Rationalization, as others have pointed out, also makes it easier for the executive leader to mistake the will for the deed—to think that his declarations of sound policy and pronouncements of good intentions are the same thing as the performance.

Bacon in one of his essays observes that those in power are peculiarly subject to the temptation of "thinking to command the end yet not to endure the means."

Head executives of organizations will frequently hide behind the failures of their lesser leaders to do certain things by saying that "since this was the announced policy of the company we assumed it was being done." And they will seriously argue against employee representation plans or labor unionism, for example, by saying that since their "door is open to every employee who has anything on his mind," there can therefore arise no grievances of which they do not become aware.

One other type of rationalized will to power familiarly encountered, especially in philanthropic organizations, is that of the leader who takes a high hand and is tyrannical in action in the name of service or helpfulness to others. The fact that others are being helped is made a cloak for treating members of one's own staff autocratically. The recent vigorous efforts at organization among professional employees of social work agencies are undoubtedly prompted in part by this kind of difficulty.

Paternalism within an organization may also represent a rationalized belief that "we know what's good for them better than they do themselves." Unfortunately this attitude can pass over all too easily into a condition where ego inflation, which the leader derives from his altruistic virtue, bears little relation to what the followers really want.

In such situations, the leader is essentially more concerned to enhance his own feeling of self-righteousness than to be really useful to others. An announced motive of helpfulness offers no excuse for conduct which is bossy. It only creates a realization by others that such a leader is a hypocrite—whether consciously or not. In taking a course of action which is in reality one of paternalism or arbitrary command, the leader who thinks he is being helpful to others is basically rationalizing his own will to power.

Rationalization is as insidious as it is prevalent. All too often when a leader is heard to say, "Well, we'll go ahead anyway," this is less a counsel of determination than it is an evidence of being more intent on ends than on discovering the right means toward them. The vivid term "wishful thinking" has been given to that rationalizing which brings conviction that what one wishes to be true, is true or will somehow become true. The leader who exaggerates to himself the amount of support he has or the supposed importance of his cause in the minds of other people, or who believes that "victory is around the corner" when it is not—is a spectacle as familiar as it is pathetic.

Somewhere in the councils of leadership there must be assured the restraint of critical comment, of honest attention to unpleasant facts, a frank facing in advance of the "whys" and the "hows" of new proposals. The bigger the enterprise or group over which leader-

ship is exercised the greater is the danger of rationalizing and of thinking in misleading, abstract, conceptual terms. Someone has to help the leader to keep close to the "pungent sense of effective reality." Someone has to "bring him down to cases" sufficiently so that his general conclusions are, not rationalized wishes or hunches but are decisions inductively built upon sufficient up-to-date evidence from present circumstances.

The more he can himself make it a consistent practice "to go back to his home constituents," "to get out into the organization," "to see his people on the job" (all, as you see, frequently suggested methods), the better will his leadership be from this point of view of confronting and coping with the changing realities of his followers' temper and reactions.

SEXUAL FRUSTRATIONS AND MALADJUSTMENTS

Illustrations of the disturbances due to sexual maladjustments among those who should lead could be offered by the score to show how these condition behavior. For example, a department store manager, whose wife had for years been confined in bed as a chronic invalid, was known to be generally soft and silly with all the young women employees with whom he could make an excuse for establishing any direct contact. He called them all by their first names or more inclusively as "dearie"; although there was no evidence that his advances ever went beyond that point, the women resented his attitude and only submitted to his familiarities because it seemed the politic thing to do.

An office manager in an insurance company was a handsome bachelor with a marked attraction for many women. With those women office workers who were attracted he encouraged further, if relatively harmless,

intimacies. And it was noticeable and obvious that the women who played up to him were the ones who got all the favors and special consideration when advancements were made. With the others he was irritable, short and rude. Naturally this developed rivalries and unrest among the workers and was extremely bad for the morale of the whole organization.

A sales manager with a staff of ten district managers brought them in to the central office for bi-monthly conferences. But his fondness for swapping dirty stories seemed regularly to eclipse his interest in marketing problems to such an extent that he was more concerned to collect from his staff new and choice stories than to help them meet their sales quotas. His criterion of good sales work and the possible value of new candidates for advancement seemed to be the contribution they made to his stock of smutty anecdotes.

A woman supervisor of thirty stenographers was a spinster of thirty-eight years who had not possessed sufficient charm to attract any serious attentions from eligible men. She knew that the opportunity for matrimony was gradually and inevitably slipping away. She became increasingly difficult to work with; she was shrewish and curt with the younger girls working for her. If a girl asked some slight favor, such as being let off a few minutes early to get to a Saturday afternoon football date, or had outside telephone calls, or in any way gave evidence that she was the recipient of male attentions, the supervisor would seem to take delight in arbitrarily seeing that all regulations were scrupulously lived up to and the girls' recreational opportunities thwarted as far as was in her power. The discontent caused by this attitude finally made it necessary for the head of the company to talk with the

supervisor to make her understand the trouble she
was creating.

Every organization in which both men and women
work has more or less experience with varying degrees
of jealousy, favoritism and covert advances, if not
actual affairs. Sometimes the leaders are parties to
this and take advantage of their positions to press their
attentions upon members of the group of the other sex.
Situations are not unknown, of course, in which the
price of securing a place in a group is to accept the
sexual advances of its leader. This kind of hazard is
completely unfortunate; self-respecting individuals who
may have wished to become members of a group with
this type of leader have only the choice of staying
out or of making it clear at the outset that they will
come in on no such outrageous terms.

But the manifestations of sexual maladjustments
are not confined to those caused by the fact that both
sexes are working together. There are the other types
of cases where the individual's behavior is influenced
by mother fixations, father fixations, narcissism, im-
potence or by more extreme evidences of sexual interest
in others of the same sex. Homosexuality among both
men and women is today honestly recognized as not
confined to isolated instances. And where it exists
among those in leadership positions, the incipient dan-
gers to sound relations with the led may be most
serious. Watchfulness for evidences that its presence is
working disruptively within the group is certainly
required in all organized relations.

What has to be realized in general is that the sexual
side of human nature is tremendously strong and per-
meating, that a place has to be made in the experience
of everyone for acknowledgment of its urgency, that

the problem of expression or sublimation must be coped with.

It therefore becomes of first importance that the sexual side of the leader's life should be ordered in ways that do not detract from his personal power. Either the individual integrates his total energy, or the conflicts, dissipations and strains of an unorganized sexual urge disrupt and lessen that energy.

The word sublimation is used to describe the fact that through the normal relations of family life and affections, or through vigorous and disciplined pursuit of some worthy objectives, many individuals are able to amalgamate their sexual urge with their total energy drive in a way to give reasonable unity to personal living. Like the will to power, the sexual will to power can be wisely and wholesomely used. And the way toward such use is through deep personal love, through profound faith in worthy aspirations, and through cultivated appreciation of beauty. Indeed, it is peculiarly the contribution of the passionate side of human nature to help enrich the individual's affectional life; to give him emotional depth and human sympathy, to enhance his sensitiveness for esthetic experience.

The modern outspokenness about sex only superficially implies acceptance of the view that self-expression requires uncontrolled sex expression. Of course, quite the contrary is true. The better understanding of the interrelations—physiological, emotional and spiritual—between the sex drive and the life drive, for which we are indebted to modern mental hygiene and psychiatry, makes it increasingly clear that the problem is one of control, organization, and wise fulfilment of the complete personality.

But just because this part of our nature is so insistent in its promptings, individuals with strong personalities

in leadership situations should first possess an honest understanding of their own natures; and second should be conscious of the need and possibility of integrating this major urge into their total efforts.

Occasionally the sources of maladjustment will prove so deep-seated and of such long standing that expert psychiatric and psychoanalytical aid must be sought. The corrective achievements in these fields have been impressive.

But in the less extreme manifestations candor, understanding, self-control and intelligent direction of energy are the more usually required prescriptions. If this brief discussion can do nothing more than bring some individual leaders and trainers of leaders to a frank facing of the dangers of sex energy uncontrolled and undirected, its purpose will be amply served.

SADISTIC TENDENCIES

The word sadism means literally the satisfaction of sexual desire by the infliction of pain on others. Secondarily it has come to mean any form of behavior from which the individual derives satisfaction, which imposes suffering, pain or cruelty upon others. Often this behavior is enjoyed by the individual without his being conscious of his own underlying motives.

This is a specially unfortunate trait for a leader to have; but it is one which is clearly present in many cases where, for example, the leader has been through a long and grueling struggle to get to his present position. "I've had to fight for everything I got, so let the rest of them go through the same mill." "Hard work is good for them." "If we mollycoddle them, they'll get too soft." These are the outward evidences of an attitude which is usually sadistic in essence. The leader

who is known as a hard master may sometimes be thus tainted. Severity easily becomes sadistic.

Moreover, this attitude is bad for the reason that it is so devoid of an educational outlook. The training experience through which the learner goes is one of sheer trial and error and unguided struggle. It implies the "sink or swim" method of training, as contrasted with the more supervised and controlled learning experience which this whole book is advocating.

One manifestation not always thought of as sadistic is the use of *sarcasm*. This is a weapon from the use of which some leaders often get great satisfaction. A group of foremen were recently asked if they occasionally used a little sarcasm, and most of them raised their hands. They were then asked, "How many of you enjoy having it used on you?" And of course no hands were raised. Similarly, any other efforts to make subordinates feel inadequate, uncomfortable or inferior fall into a related category. A department head assigned a man a piece of work with the remark, "You ought to be able to finish this in ten hours." Then he turned to his assistant and said when the man was out of hearing, "That job can't be done under twenty hours but it will be good for him to try like hell and see what he can do."

Whenever it is found that the leader is getting a diabolical glee out of the hardships, sufferings and deprivations of his followers, *which he is no longer sharing with them,* this abnormal tendency is showing itself. And the symptoms of it should cause apprehension to everyone concerned because the integrity of the leader's relation to the led is at stake.

In this whole connection it is important to bring out the influence in behavior of the *personality image* which the leader holds of himself. Each of us carries about a

conception or picture of himself, as he supposes or wants himself to appear and be. If this is at variance with the facts *as others see them*, the discrepancy between the self-image and the opinion of others may create difficulties. Or the leader may appear ridiculous in his assumed role. We are all familiar with the pompous, self-important executive of short stature, who is picturing himself as a Napoleonic personality, with the Don Juan type who is sure that he is "God's gift to women," or with the man with a reputation as an orator who wants to be called on "for a few remarks" on all public occasions.

Accurately speaking, there are probably four facets of the truth to be taken account of in the kind of self-analysis that may profitably be urged as an aid here. These are: what I am; what I think I am; what others think I am; and what I think others think I am.

Every leader should ask himself occasionally in the greatest possible candor for his own appraisal of these four facts about himself. This is not an easy thing to do. "Know thyself" is a dictum of mature wisdom. But it has always to be remembered that what we are is determined not alone by what we think of ourselves in all honesty, but also *by how we are regarded by others*. The leader is in large measure what other people— and particularly his followers—*think he is*. And what they think is shown by their attitude and conduct in relation to him. In a profound sense the leader's image of himself is no more accurate than his knowledge of how his group regards him.

In conclusion, the corrective line to be followed, whether one's self-image is inaccurate or whether one is suffering from some compensatory or obsessive behavior, is *reeducation in the light of full knowledge of the causes of the maladjustment. Discover and confront*

the realities—that is the general dictate which must be followed where any of the several kinds of potential hazard to leadership above enumerated are found to be present. Sometimes one can do this for oneself. In more acute instances it requires the services of fellow-leaders, of advisers, of trusted lieutenants, to help the process of looking the facts squarely in the face in order to discover how they can be corrected. And in the definitely pathological stages, expert medical psychiatric and psychoanalytical aid is of course needed.

It would be unfortunate, however, to convey the impression that everyone is a little queer and has to be looked at askance as suspect. That is not the intention of this chapter. On the other hand, with the better knowledge of human nature which recent study has produced, it should be possible to spare society a vast deal of suffering caused by leaders who are using their positions to exhibit traits or compensate for deficiencies in ways which harm others.

PROBLEMS OF WOMEN LEADERS

A ROSTER of successful women leaders would be a long one, and it is certainly destined continuously to increase as the situations multiply in which women are found to equal or excel men as leaders. The whole interpretation of leadership which this book seeks to forward should, indeed, appeal to women especially. For the leader in the old sense of boss (the commander) used traits superficially thought of as masculine, while the leader as influencer (the teacher) uses traits many of which are often thought of as feminine. Of course an admixture of these traits is necessary in the effective leader, man or woman. But the woman as leader usually has an intuitive sympathy for the approach which is persuasive rather than for that which is strong-arm.

Generalizations on the whole score of sex differentiations are easy to make and practically impossible to prove.[1] And there is no thought of adding here unsupported contentions which further no improvements in human relations. But everyone who has had experience in organizations where some of the executive leaders are women has again and again heard women workers say that they would rather work for men than for women. It is this frequently met comment which largely prompts a special analysis of the woman leader's problem even though all that has gone before is equally applicable to both sexes. Furthermore, because men and women leaders are increasingly having to work together—in politics, business, education, social and

civic work—the problems raised by such relationships require acknowledgment. ﹐

There are no doubt as many exceptions to the comment that women prefer to work for men as there are instances of it. Certainly in most organizations exclusively composed of women there are many effective leaders and thousands of happy followers. But it has been interesting to try to discover why the comment arises at all. The testimony which is here assembled only emphasizes certain factors already discussed in general terms. The differences in effectiveness between men and women leaders exist only in degree not, of course, in kind. Hence only a brief statement of the comments of women followers on their leaders will be made; then the question as to why these criticisms arise will be faced; and finally a consideration of what can be done about it will be offered.

WOMEN'S COMMENTS ON WOMEN LEADERS

In listening to the following comments of women followers, women leaders should always remember that other women are inevitably their most severe critics. To get recognition the woman has to do a conspicuously better job as leader than a man in the comparable post. Her excellence has to be indisputable, her disinterestedness notable. Women have traditionally perhaps been taught to think of men as managers, and in scrutinizing leaders of their own sex to see how they compare, they may be captious and unsympathetic in picking flaws.

Women followers often criticize women leaders, first, as "too personal." Presumably this means that the latter do not make the necessary distinction between loyalty to the group aim and loyalty to themselves. They may want to feel that the followers are tied to them as individuals.

Women leaders, it is also alleged, "do not give sufficient credit to those who work with them." This is no doubt an outgrowth of the woman leader's frequent feeling of insecurity of status caused by the rigor of competition among women in the present state of economic uncertainty, together with a lack of self-confidence. Also, the fact that the woman leader has had to work relatively hard to attain her status and realizes that her followers may not have striven so devotedly and sacrificially, may tend to make her peculiarly grudging of praise and vigorous in criticism. From whatever combination of influence it arises, this reluctance of women to commend is certainly one of the most frequently mentioned comments on the part of other women.

Women leaders, again, are said to be "too fussy and particular and prying." They tend to over-individualize their supervision. Their oversight tends to be too constant and too insistent, too absorbed in details both of what others are doing and of tasks which she herself assumes. This tendency to interfere during the execution of assigned work is a common failing. It is probably also the rock upon which the harmony of house-servants and their mistresses most often founders.

Yet the good leader must respect the ego of her followers, must have confidence in their powers of self-propulsion and execution. She must accord respect to individuals as such—which means giving them a certain latitude of behavior, a certain freedom from too continued watching. This requires a certain detachment and objectiveness of view, a certain patience and a serene confidence in the appealing power of the purposes to be served.

Women leaders may in turn be unduly sceptical of their women workers. They say they "know them too well"—which usually refers in an unflattering way to their capacity for group loyalty. And this is not an attitude which makes for persuasive leadership. Certainly confidence in others requires a more constant feeling that one can expect real loyalty.

This absence of trust in other women is something for women leaders to face frankly. Here is a place where the values produced by affection for those being led can be most helpful. Women followers may possibly be handicapped in some instances by conflicts of objective which have deep biological roots. Some of the vital things they desire as individuals may seem to them to be at odds with the aims of groups they are forced for economic reasons to join.

But the woman leader who understands her sex and loves her followers will naturally trust them more genuinely and effectively just because of this sense of the limits within which she may have to work. Certainly the attitude of disparaging people for traits which are the inevitable birthright of human nature is one which every sensible leader will try to avoid. It should never be forgotten that to work sympathetically, yet realistically with human nature *as he or she finds it*, is the mark of the wise leader.

It is probably also true that women set a higher standard of performance for women working under them than men do. This would be natural and is no doubt a sound impulse on the woman leader's part. But high standards can unquestionably be maintained without too much close personal oversight and the use of better organization methods is frequently the answer. The accusation against certain women execu-

tives of being "finicky" and "nosey" stands never-theless as recurring.

A less serious criticism, perhaps, is that working for women "is not exciting enough. We like to have some men around." This is not so trivial as it sounds, how-ever, when one realizes how much the woman's work setting may be the best normal means for her to meet and associate with men under present conditions.

Finally, one meets the contention that women executives do not like to have those under them "get too good" or "try to get ahead too fast." Here again motives of fear and jealousy may be occasionally at work among less well established women leaders.

If these, then, are some of the strictures leveled at some women leaders by other women, it is interesting to consider what may cause them.

WHAT MAKES THE DIFFERENCE?

Whatever special causes there are will perhaps best be understood in the light of some historic perspective on the social and economic background and experience of women. For whatever difficulties may exist in fact derive in all probability from earlier training and outlook rather than from more basic differences between men and women.

The normal woman in western society has for genera-tions functioned almost exclusively in the medium of individual relationships and small group contacts. Her family and her neighbors were her principal *milieu*. And so far as the aspect of purposefulness was a factor in her leadership in these situations, it was the purpose of assuring family stability and security. That stability was typically assured as the woman obtained the economic support which accompanied marriage to a "good provider." The price which women paid to

preserve a personal integrity of sorts and to secure fulfilment of the sexual side of their natures, was economic dependence on the husband. There was always the opportunity for exercising an important leadership role in the family clan, but it was an opportunity limited to this.

All this experience has seemingly accentuated certain thought patterns and attitudes which are not quickly lost, although the domestic and economic status of women has undergone great change in the last century. Possibilities of economic independence exist today on an unprecedented scale. The smaller size of families and improvements in the techniques of the household lessen the central focus of the home. Just how these and other factors stressing equality of social status are going to affect the interest of women in broader tasks, it is still too soon to know. Probably for a majority any profound changes in attitude are still to come. And whether this will modify woman's active relation to society as much as is assumed by the more extreme feminists is questionable.

Certain imponderable facts remain. Women function uniquely as the bearers and rearers of children, and in that biological role they must have economic support assured, at least for a number of years. They must still—in the absence of the endowment of motherhood—find a man to provide that support if they elect to have a family—for reasons both economic and conventional. And that necessity for giving thought to the conditions under which she can become a mother and satisfy the maternal side of her nature with full social sanction, may properly become a preponderantly modifying influence in a woman's life.

The greater ease with which the woman of today can achieve a relatively independent economic status, and

can, with modern knowledge of birth control methods, enter into sex relations with men—all this has not changed her problem in its essentials. The demands of her personality as a whole will, as with men, always rise above the mere demands of food, shelter and sex. The psychic elements and spiritual cravings still remain to be reckoned with.

The upshot of all this seems to be that although we appear to be experiencing a profound change in the relation of women to society—one which happily takes far greater account of them as individuals— underneath there remain as constant the insistent demands of her nature as a woman and also as a person. These are crucial; they are exceedingly personal and individualized in focus; they are ignored at her peril; they are the forces around which her life gravitates. And if that center of gravity is shifted in an extreme and forced way from what she finds to be her central interests, the hazard to the woman is great. The well-springs of satisfaction and life realization tend to dry up and leave the individual thwarted and shriveled.

The relation of these considerations to the difficulties of women as leaders is close. In the light of them let us see what are some of the salient facts in women's modern group relations, where her opportunities to lead have become so numerous.

Women leaders today are typically found in one of three dilemmas. First, in order to compete with men in attaining or holding a leadership position, they may believe that it is necessary for them virtually to deny their sex. They may try to turn their back upon it, ignore it and "rise above it." They may think they are successful when they evoke the comment "She is just like a man."

Second, they may use their position as leaders as a compensation for an inability, however caused, to function sexually and psychically as women. They may do this either repressively and with violence to their true natures, or by a process of sublimation which can under a well-disciplined self-control afford an adequate outlet for the whole personality through socially beneficent channels.

Third, they may try to be both woman and leader—lover and mother and worker in the world. But under present economic arrangements they are in danger of finding this an exceedingly demanding challenge, and ultimately perhaps experience a weariness of the flesh so profound that successful attainment is denied in both directions.

Again, bearing in mind the severity of competition for livelihood and status and the newness of women's emergence into numerous group relationships, it may well be true that the individual woman leader feels required to think of herself and her progress more intently and constantly than does a man in the same situation. Especially with older women leaders who have not married and must support themselves, this may result in a subtle and all but unrecognized jealousy of her younger women followers. Under these conditions she may be jealous of whatever other claims are made upon them which tend to distract or divide their interest and loyalty—whether these claims are made by men, children, friends or others. She may be jealous of them as younger, "more eligible" women or as aspirants for her position as leader.

Although this influence might seem to be more crucially a factor in an organization of both men and women workers, it can also be observed at work in organizations exclusively run by women. It certainly

is not unnatural that occasionally the older woman should be affected by this resentment of the sexual attraction of her younger women followers. They offer constant reminders of her own sacrifices, lost opportunities to fulfill her life on its sexual side and her lessening attractions. So crucial to the development of complete personality is the relation of individuals of one sex to those of the other and so rightly important is this relation in the woman's life, that it would be surprising if it did not become a factor in the background of consciousness of many women leaders.

Of course jealousy for other reasons is a force in men's groups also. But the truth is that in relation to their sexual and parental interests it has conventionally been easier for men to organize that side of their lives in ways which do not involve such direct conflicts with their group interests.

Moreover, the fact that the woman leader may gather around her younger and impressionable women who have "crushes" on her, does not contradict but rather substantiates this whole contention. For the "crush" itself, beyond a limited point, is compensatory, transitory and a fixation not soundly rooted—for either the giver or the receiver of the affection. Jealousy is here nominally and temporarily in abeyance only because an emotion has been developed which may satisfy the leader's ego just so long as it is not threatened by some shift in the follower's affection.

Or, again, if the relationship goes to further lengths and becomes actively homosexual, a decidedly unfortunate danger may enter. The likelihood of more and more complicated and disruptive jealousies becomes practically inevitable whenever the leader's affection is transferred from one to another among the led.

Because the woman's whole ego has fundamentally to be satisfied in her total effective expression, it is observably true that the nearer her group purposes have been to the normal individual interests of women as women, the happier she is. The more abstract and impersonal the objectives of the organization are, the harder it may be for her to maintain that passionate devotion to them which is the mark of the leader.

In other words, the true source of women's power as leaders seems to lie close to their deep concerns as woman. And this is as it should be. When this truth is ignored and women assume posts of responsibility which artificially force their loyalty—as is true, for example, in many business positions of executive leadership— the result both in the effect on the woman's personality and on the quality of leadership is likely to be unwholesome and ugly. A certain hardness develops; a protective shell of impersonality which is neither masculine nor feminine becomes encrusted over the individual. Other women working under a person in whom this kind of sacrifice of integrity is taking place naturally resent it. Indeed they are often frightened by it. And they instinctively prefer a leader whose personality is not being marred by forced efforts to hold an absorbed enthusiasm which has no inner conviction.

The woman who is going to realize her real selfhood as a leader should look well to it that the cause she serves is worthy of her, appeals to her and does not involve her in commitments which betray her real interests and desires. Nothing is more deeply disruptive and fatiguing to the spirit than the effort to realize objectives which seem remote, unreal or false to one's own nature.

It is not, for example, by chance that women are largely the leaders and the practitioners in such fields

as nursing, interior decoration, child welfare and
education, certain aspects of civic betterment, birth
control agitation and the like. The large field for women
in department store positions falls also in many ways
within the range of her interests as a home-maker,
family consumer and provider of the amenities for
the woman's person and the family setting.

A final factor to be acknowledged is the constant
danger that the woman leader will become fatigued
and make overdrafts upon her store of energy. One
certainly sees too many instances where "nerves,"
irritability and loss of sustained driving power of
wholesome kind become all but chronic. Too many
women in executive situations have nervous break
downs, or are constantly on the verge of having one.

Leadership is hard work. The process of rising to
leadership is hard work. It demands sacrifice and self-
discipline. There has to be renunciation all along the
line and this is just as true for men as for women.
But with women the demand may be the more exacting
because of the deeply rooted character of the renuncia-
tion so often required and the divisive conflicts to
which it may give rise.

Other causes may also contribute to fatigue. If,
as is often the case, a woman leader is trying also to
run a home and a family or have an outside social
career, the tax upon her strength is great. The very
job of striving to maintain her leadership position
in the face of competition, real or imagined, is onerous.
For frequently the woman leader is on the defensive to
prove constantly that she can deliver. Also she is
likely to be overly conscientious in the full performance
of her labors, which keeps her at her job for longer
hours and prompts her to worry over it more at home,
than is usually true of men. Fatigue is an immensely

debilitating influence, killing enthusiasm and fostering doubt of self and others. Hence the woman leader has to use every precaution not to become a physical or nervous wreck.

Her whole effort may thus mean a sacrifice which, necessary though it may be, is likely to take its toll in parts of the personality which are most precious. And any process which puts a constant strain on the whole organism is sooner or later bound to harm it.

It would, however, be unfair to a complete picture not to emphasize the fact that potent though such jealousy and fatigue may become, one sees plenty of cases where neither appears to be a factor. There are many women who have organized their lives to obviate these shortcomings. And for that reason it becomes essential to see how this can be done.

WHAT CAN WOMEN DO ABOUT IT?

First and all the time, the woman who would lead should harbor her energy, preserve her good health, keep free of chronic fatigue. This is a counsel of perfection under present economic arrangements. But she must at least become aware of the way in which the drains and strains on her health cut down her power to lead. Specific suggestions would have to be personal. But every woman can strive to get adequate vacations, to avoid continuous overtime work, to have her domestic responsibilities shared by competent assistants, to use her recreation as a truly re-creative force, to integrate her sexual and love life happily so that its harmony contributes to her personal serenity and flow of energy.

Frankly, the relation of the conduct of her love life to the rest of her activity is likely to be a crucial factor

in her problem. Let that side of her living be normal for her; let her know the devotion and supporting comradeship of a man whom she loves; let her be privileged to enjoy the duties and joys of motherhood if she so elects—and other difficulties can be coped with, if not completely, at least more valiantly.

Although the exceptions may be almost as numerous as the supporting instances, the broad generalization remains as true for women as for men that the fulfillment of their personalities is facilitated by the opportunity to love and be loved, to give and to get a fine and deep personal affection. And everything which women executives, teachers, social workers, religious and institutional workers and all the rest can do to escape the blight of a thwarted and repressed love life on its highest plane will be of the utmost value. Laws, regulations and social conventions which interpose any restrictions upon the rights of such leaders to marry and still work are an anachronism. Positive provisions, such as widows' pensions and part-time working arrangements, which make it easier to have and bring up children, should also be strenuously advocated.

It will, of course, be pointed out that the right opportunity for the right marriage does not fall to the lot of every woman and that certain religious orders or other interests may supply women with a satisfying career without matrimonial ties. Many women also have chances to marry which they do not choose to accept. All of these are facts in the situation to be fully faced. And individually many women unquestionably find a fine and even exalted expression of their deepest aspirations in interests which redirect their total energy into human service of various kinds. Spiritual faith, devotion to humanity, the service of the church and social service—all supply purposes which can

absorb everything a woman has to give. Devotion to
such purposes can be cultivated so as to bring fulness
into many otherwise unhappy lives.

Healthy women should realize that this devotion has
to be charged with a deep conviction and burning
passion if it is to become a full sublimation. Perhaps
the more profound way to state the issues here is to
say that it is for each person to discover in all areas of
living how to achieve that inner balance which she
basically seeks.

Naturally decision in such matters is always depend-
ent upon highly personal factors. Nevertheless, and
again speaking broadly, older women leaders owe it to
their younger colleagues to point out to them that
what may seem a satisfactory adjustment and decision
to a single woman of twenty-five may be looked back
upon with regret and bitterness as shortsightedness at
forty-five.

The virginal spinster, trying bravely to occupy posts
where leadership qualities are called for, is sometimes
both unhappy and ineffective. And that ill-conceived
feminism which has subtly tended to encourage women
to undergo the misplaced sacrifices of "careerism" has
combined with the older religious and moral pressures
toward sexual renunciation to support an ideal for
many women which certainly fails to take account
of the whole truth. Fortunately it is an ideal no longer
as attractive as formerly. But it still claims its victims.

The first thing for the woman leader to ask of herself
is: Am I doing everything possible to assure continu-
ously that the undeniable affectional side of my life
is acknowledged and realized?

There are various ways in which this acknowledgment
can be wisely made. There is no one correct universal
pattern. For the majority, however, the true love of

man for woman and woman for man does include and give reasonable proportion to the essential emotional demands of life for each. It heightens and deepens as nothing else does the sense of beauty and the capacity for warm affection and human sympathy.

Sexual experience without love is certainly no solution for most women. Sexual affairs founded on true affection, but for whatever reason carried on furtively and without public acknowledgment, have usually been found to produce more anguish and heartache than happiness and unity of spirit. The kind of anguish portrayed by Sinclair Lewis in "Ann Vickers" as the outcome of his heroine's efforts in this direction is undoubtedly all too typical. It takes a woman of brave and hardy spirit to endure the ignominies and essential constrictions upon the free and outgoing expression of her personality, which this poor second-best alternative usually involves.

Many women, on the other hand, find an emotional substitute in close and constant friendship with another woman. This achieves a depth and intimacy of remarkable intensity, and in conjunction with other outlets, seems to supply the medium for an affectionate life of considerable vitality. But it should be pointed out that this is not an easy sublimation to effect; and it may be less satisfying to the individual woman than it is allowed to appear to the world at large.

When it comes to marriage, the secret of its success for the woman leader clearly lies in a willingness to be deeply committed to another human being. The woman of strong purpose, like the man so motivated, may tend to resent the division of her basic loyalties which true love may seem to inject into her emotional life. And fear of this division may tempt her to refuse to marry or may even cause her to fail in it and thus

bring an unfortunate denial or sense of frustration of her own deepest self in unfortunate ways.

The difficulty which this suggests is a real one for the modern woman of exceptional energy and sense of self-direction. It is the difficulty of finding the man to love who will be broad and deep enough in his affection to admit her right to self-realization in part through her self-chosen leadership task. The small-gauged man will tend to be jealous of her other interests. He will be impatient with her occasional preoccupation, fatigue and the special outside demands upon her. This has been the experience of many able women. And it argues, of course, that such a person must exercise unusual caution in the choice of a husband.

On the other side is the problem of the woman leader who gains greater prominence and a fuller sense of achievement than her husband, and who has therefore in some way to try to support his sense of fulfillment without too invidious comparisons being made. For such a relation to remain a success certainly requires all the understanding and affection which both individuals can bring to it.

Whether it is better to have loved and (perhaps) lost than never to have loved at all, each woman has to decide for herself. But on the whole the profound satisfaction and true fulfillment which affection brings—even when it proves to carry in its wake a heavy burden of disappointment and sorrow—seems to be the alternative which is fundamentally happier for most people, men and women alike. Happy the woman to whom the two alternatives do not present themselves as distinct choices, but who finds it possible to allow love to enrich her pursuit of other objectives and her pursuit of these to be illuminated by the light and warmth of her personal affection.

Sublimation of the sexual urge is to some degree a universal requirement. But where the woman leader decides for any reason that it has to be complete, she should consciously realize that the effort to keep the springs of emotional warmth flowing freely and fully out to her followers may entail an unusual effort.

Emphasis should be put in the next place upon the special importance of a freer use of commendation by the woman leader. If she knows her own task thoroughly, has confidence in her own ability to deliver, is finding outlets normally for the emotional side of her nature, it should then be relatively easy for her to give credit where credit is due, to be generous of praise where it is merited, to encourage initiative and growth among her followers. Here is where the big personality and the true leader will reveal herself. For there must be explicit appreciation of work well done, if leadership influences are to be effective.

Be generous, sincere and gracious in offering commendation where it is due. Don't be afraid to praise good work! Women leaders apparently cannot repeat these admonitions too often to themselves.

In this connection one important way to help make the total personality more mellow, so that a proper perspective is kept on the objectives being served and a rightful appreciation is being accorded to the labors of others, is for the woman leader *to develop consciously some outside interests*. When one is married, interests centering in her home may well supply the needed corrective to a too fanatical zeal about the leadership task. Or some other broadening interest may serve. Part of the price too often paid by the woman leader for her position is a progressive narrowing and overconcentration of her interests. Whether it be home, art, music, dancing, athletics, literature or social work, she

will be a wise leader who can bring into the ambit of her deeply felt concerns, some other project than her major one. This can do something profound for her own soul. It widens the possible points of human contact with her followers and with the world at large. It brings added awareness as to the relative importance of her main drive. It is far less important what interest is chosen, than that *some* interest is selected and ardently espoused.

The reaction of this avocational interest upon the followers can be peculiarly beneficial. For it is highly important to convince them that the leader is not merely an embodied dynamo or a zealot with one fixed idea, but is a human being with some sense of proportion about the amenities and values in life as a whole and with some delights and desires apart from the project being led.

Also the outside hobby or avocation can serve a sublimative function in cases where the whole personality is not otherwise able to express itself. But for it to be truly valuable, the individual must *commit herself* to the outside interest vigorously and intelligently. Dabbling and casual or dilettante attention to the avocation will yield little good. There must be developed a real sense of mastery and a genuine enthusiasm for the outlet chosen, if salutary results and deep satisfaction are to come. And this requires, of course, that enough energy is reserved from the leader's major drive to flow over effectively into her avocation. If energy is thus salvaged for the outside interest, it becomes further true that more energy is thus brought back again to the main drive. The productive value of this interpenetration of energy and interest back and forth from one focus of attention to another is a fundamental fact in the human organism.

It is a part of that rhythm of tension and relaxation which is basic to life.

A further implication here is an attitude toward those being led which will result in allowing them the chance to carry out tasks in their own way without too great dictation over details and too constant supervision during execution, in granting them greater responsibility as they show power to exercise it and in encouraging them to grow in their own way. This, as already said, requires two things. It requires that work instructions and standards be carefully laid down. And it requires that the leader strive to build up a spirit among the followers that prompts to conscientious performance because they enjoy carrying on.

*   *   *   *   *   *

The comments of this chapter are designed to contribute aid and comfort to that profoundly vital and necessary movement for the fuller realization of the individuality of women, which is now going forward in the four quarters of the globe. It is a spiritual movement of deep import, fraught with the utmost value for women and society as a whole, and it is probably only in its beginning.

Because of its significance, it is desirable that those women who increasingly are thrust into positions of leadership shall carry the mantle of authority and wear the crown of acknowledged public influence with grace and comeliness. All this implies no idealizing of any special traits of women—which are of doubtful reality. But there are unquestionably certain attitudes which normally are more manifest in women than in men, just as there are certain others of which the reverse is true. The combination of energetic, enthusiastic purposefulness with warmth of fellow feeling and desire for

the followers' cooperative participation in a unified effort, which is the mark of the good leader, is in fact a bringing together of those traits popularly characterized as masculine and feminine. Both kinds of qualities are essential and both are present in differing proportions in every man and woman.

That is why any disposition of women leaders to ape men leaders is unfortunate. They thus do violence to their own natures.

What is profoundly needed is more evidence of essential womanliness. The good woman leader is the most womanly person. She copies no models not to her own taste. She follows her natural impulse to win those she leads through her sympathies and enthusiasms. To every leader's capacity to energize and focus purposefulness, she peculiarly has the chance to add the exercise of her power of personal interest and human understanding, of her natural directness of individual approach and affection. Unmistakably the finest women leaders have been those who have remained most themselves, who have been proud of themselves as women and who have thus added to their stature and insight through pride in the integrity of their own essential femininity.

The good woman leader will know that in her grasp of every problem she naturally tends to give an emphasis to certain aspects which men may be inclined to slight. If, from a superficial point of view this is her limitation, it is also her glory and strength.

Chapter XIV

THE LEADER'S DEEPER RESOURCES

EVEN at its most modest level the act of leading implies several efforts which have thus far only been hinted at. Efforts must be made to hold loyalty to the group cause over prolonged periods; to make the group agree that what may be the hard and sacrificial way is the right way; to maintain an outlook on the part of all which recognizes that it is the journey more than the arrival which is important, the struggle as much as the victory which is satisfying.

It is usual to impute to the leader the task of inspiring the led. But it is less usual for us to grasp what is involved in this and to realize what obligation this places upon the leader.

In most group projects action has to be sustained, disciplines have to be observed, at least minor individual privations have to be undergone in the interest of a larger good. Prolonged efforts may be sustained by confidence and with sacrifice; but on the other hand they may yield boredom, disillusion, discouragement or the individual's withdrawal from the group. "If to do were as easy as to know what to do," there would be less need for inspiration—for breathing new life into the followers. But it is a familiar fact of human experience that people have to be rallied to loyal support again and again.

Assurance, enthusiasm, zealous conviction of value, meaning and direction—these are what people in groups are searching for. They ask to be rescued from the forces

of inertia, monotony, stupidity and cupidity—from too self-centered living. *It is this rescue which the leader helps to bring.* "We touch him in life's throng and press, and we are whole again." This is the heartening and renewing feeling the leader conveys. Where but from him come renewed zest, sureness of faith and certainty of rightness?

He at least must cherish the firm conviction that *the effort is worth while.* And this conviction is an unreasoned or non-rational one as often as it is logically demonstrable. The important thing is that it should enable the followers to emerge out of doubt into confidence. Each group has its own faith in itself which needs support. A conference leader wants to preserve the conviction that out of group conference comes a helpful harmonizing of human thoughts and desires. A trade association secretary wants assurance that there is need for less competition and more cooperation within his industry. The labor union leader must maintain his faith that collective dealings between workers and employers are a vast improvement over individual bargaining. A college president holds the faith that the enterprise of learning and the search for truth are worthy for their own sakes.

Indeed, the immediate faith of the leader may be in a cause which is relatively small in compass. A foreman may see all his world in terms of the conduct of one department of a few dozen men. The pastor may seek salvation exclusively for a parish of only a few hundred souls. A teacher's vision may extend little beyond the thirty pupils before her. This restricted range of interest is perhaps human and inevitable. But where it means also that the leader's vision and imagination cannot *relate* his particular effort to a larger effort, there is a real loss in the quality of leader-

ship and in the inspiration it can impart. The bigger
the setting and the meaning in terms of which each
leadership situation can be imaginatively conducted,
the stronger will be the leader and the more compelling
his inspiration.

For where strong faith in the particular effort is
present and is imparted, it has its own inner power of
infection. It has a compulsion which is transmitted,
for it pervades every act of the leader and gives him
that which others long to have.

Moreover, beyond the conviction that the particular
group effort is worth while, is the further demand of
many followers to be sure that anything is worth while.
Are struggle and denial worth undergoing for any cause?
A department head in a business organization may
readily reply that this is no problem which he has to
bother himself with. But in a day of ethical, economic
and spiritual bewilderment, if people tend to reply to
every summons to group effort, "Why bother?", it is
obvious that this attitude will affect their behavior and
nullify the effort to lead.

It seems necessary, in short, that the really strong
leader should believe in some meaning in human
living, in some fruitful outcome of human effort, in
some sense that mankind struggles not against but
essentially in harmony with the animating power of
the universe. The best leader has faith in the world
as a place where there is a real better and worse, where
these are somewhat ascertainable, and where effort
toward the good can yield appreciable results.

Only when a leader has such a faith does he possess
the essence of the deepest inspiration which people
crave to gain from him.

Again, within the admittedly ethical realm, the
universal experience that "when I would do good,

evil is present with me" makes the problem of securing support for good intentions a constant one. The reality of individual failures and betrayals of group aspirations is not to be ignored. Such there will always be. Every group is endangered by the backsliders potentially in its midst. And the good leader does not try to escape responsibility for offering support to those whose zeal is weakening. He will help to make the seemingly right path the easier one to follow. His support will add zest to realizing the harder choice. Evil is a fact. In associated human efforts *where objectives are worthy*, disloyalty to the group, whatever form it takes in the individual's life, may become evil. However reluctant the leader may be to think of his role in these moral terms, if he is worthy of his place he will necessarily rise to this aspect of his task.

With this deeper demand upon him, how is he to equip himself to meet it? How is he to possess that conviction and confidence about the enterprise of living which will make him a tower of strength?

THE SOURCES OF INNER CONVICTION

The good leader has faith. There is unfortunately no other word which might be less objectionable to some readers to convey what is here meant. But it should be possible to suggest a precise usage for the word despite the fact that vague meanings may have conventionally been attached to it.

Faith has well been conceived as "the giving substance to things hoped for and as the conviction of things not seen." As the word is here used it connotes an active effort to bring good to pass based on the confirming experience that such activity is and does good. It is not a mere fatuous trust in something nor a

mere wish for something. It is a corroboration, which the individual finds through his own efforts, of his sense that worth is being achieved.

More explicitly, in what does the leader have faith?

In the first place, the leader must have faith in people —in the essential soundness of their impulses, in the eventual appeal to them of the better over the worse, as these are disclosed by experience or insight. He has faith in their preference for love over hatred, for kindness over cruelty, for hopefulness over despair, for creativeness over destructiveness. The leader has to be willing to trust people. He has to act on the assumption that when they are committed genuinely to appealing purposes they will on the whole tend to carry on toward their realization.

Implicit in this is his faith that people want to be soundly led and can be influenced in the direction of their own best aims.

This is far from saying that the leader is gullible or credulous. Supervision, discipline, sacrifice, renewed stimulation and repeated summons to endeavor— these are necessary. But the leader should appreciate the fact that he is working with human material possessed of certain accountable characteristics. And unless he knows his material and has faith in its qualities, he will not be able to work because he will have nothing reliable and stable to work with.

The capacity for response and devotion among normal people is unbelievably great if only the leader knows how to tap the sources of human desire. People stand pathetically ready to be summoned. But the cause must be clearly recognizable as *good for them* in the profoundest sense. They must feel that they are called to *realize themselves* at new levels of attainment. It is not the leader who says, "I call you to a career

of happiness with me" who has this wiser faith. It is rather the one—as the history of great movements shows—who, putting his challenge on a higher level, says in effect, "He that loveth father and mother more than me, is not worthy of me."

This statement is not, of course, to be interpreted literally in all leadership situations. It rather suggests the ardor of the commitment which the true leader calls out.

In other words, faith in the willingness of people to respond to the appeal which finds selfhood in the enlargement of the self—that is the needed quality. People will, of course, under present conditions, accept the summons, "Come and I will help you make a lot of money." But what leader ever *permanently* held his following and was endeared in the memory of mankind with such a slogan? Rather his faith is vindicated— whether in the shop, the school or the political arena— when he says, "Follow me and I will help you find your true self in the realizing of some aim which ultimately furthers truth or justice or beauty or righteousness."

Particularly is this true today when everyone has to express himself largely through various organized group activities.

Fundamentally, a deeper kind of faith seems also invaluable if not essential. It may be called a spiritual faith.

The words are not popular today because so often used as a cloak of hazy thinking and as implying an indiscriminately optimistic feeling about life— one which is grounded in no deep experience or justified by no tested convictions. There is, nevertheless, a permissible even if non-rational belief, by whatever name it is called, that the enterprise of living has meaning

and values which are precious, permanent and not at odds with the larger processes of the universe.

This is not the place in which to enlarge upon the reasons why such a faith may be tenable. But it should be possible to characterize it so that its value in relation to leadership will be appreciated.

At bottom one of two views of living can be held. Either life can be lived as if it had meaning and human effort therefore counts toward the interpretation and realizing of that meaning. Or it can be held to have no meaning. Human effort then becomes an illusion and all is futility. Few people act consistently as if they believed the second view. Yet there are plenty in this day who think they believe something like this and at least give this attitude lip service. In important decisions these people may allow their futilitarianism to creep in and paralyze effort and accomplishment.

Such a philosophy, however unconsciously held, is certainly no philosophy for a leader. For the leader is essentially the affirmer, the doer, the creator. He preeminently believes that purposes can be realized, that experience can be directed and controlled, that events can be molded nearer to the heart's desire.

The contagion of power cannot spring from a sense of futility or profound pessimism. And no one lavishes energy and creative effort on any project for long unless he believes the task worth doing. Rather the normal and sane demand of ordinary people is for an underlying sense of hope, meaning and growth.

Of course, there are degrees of importance in the tasks undertaken. But every leadership situation involves an attitude in both leader and followers which tacitly agrees that their objective has value, is more or less attainable, and has some relation of significance to other life activities. The leader should impart enough

of the conviction of its human worth-whileness to give
it tang and zest.

All effort is in the last analysis sustained by faith
that it is worth making. Faith in attainment or pessi-
mism—these are the inescapable alternatives.

The greater the leader the more assuredly is there
present in him—sometimes articulately and sometimes
only implicitly—faith that "all is not vanity," that
"life means intensely and it means good." The greater
leaders have acted as if life's values were real and
permanent; as if living possessed an inner meaning and
significance; as if the good once attained could not be
lost or destroyed; and as if courage, endurance and
resignation to the inevitable were worthy adult
attributes.

More than this, the greatest leaders have been
sustained by a belief that they were in some way
instruments of destiny, that they tapped hidden
reserves of power, that they truly lived as they tried
to live in harmony with some greater, more universal
purpose or intention in the world.

Such a faith is not popular today. Some would con-
tend that it is not tenable. Some will accept only what
they can prove logically. Others might even admit that
such a faith would disturb their pleasant habits of
life.

Yet many truly sensitive people do in fact discover
in themselves an inexplicable restlessness and despair
over the surface preoccupations of living and are
demanding something more to hold to. They want
more unity and purpose to animate their lives.

Such individuals—an increasing number—inevitably
grope for a faith which somehow enlarges the self and
brings a more satisfying sense of reality and value.
They yearn to give of themselves in creative effort, in

love, in appreciation. They yearn to belong to some real *community* of persons and interests.

No easy prescription can be written to suggest how this profound faith can be attained. The sense of a need for it is probably the first requirement. The second may be a candid self-examination as to what stands in the way of its acceptance. Habits of self-searching and meditation are completely out of vogue; yet it may well be that some return in the direction of these would lead us all to a more honest acknowledgment of what we really value. A certain worldliness of aspiration may have caused neglect of impulses ready to be acknowledged if only given a chance.

But however it may be attainable, such a faith has been a personal boon before, and it will be again.

Again, the experience of great leaders suggests a further element too vital to be ignored. No accounting for the strength of their inner resources can fail to appreciate the part that suffering has played in their development. They have seemed in many instances to discover their faith and power in meeting and over-coming opposition of one sort or another, in surmount-ing seemingly insurmountable obstacles, in refusing to admit defeat, in sacrificing to the limit for their cause. In a word they have suffered in the depths of their being as one of the prices paid for the superb confidence and courage they were gradually able to manifest.

This highest type of moral heroism is admittedly not frequently encountered. It represents the crowning achievement of fidelity in the human spirit. But some approximation toward it, let it be also admitted, would be desirable for those who would be strong and com-pelling leaders. Thus armed they can infuse their cause with a real energy; they can dignify their purpose; they can draw upon the deepest yearnings of their

followers. Always the leader who has been able to relate his objectives to the spiritual aspirations more or less unconsciously locked in the depth of people's hearts, gets the stronger hold and the more vigorous release of energy.

Finally, there will occur those occasions when the leader will need all the support of his own faith in the face of the inertia or drawing away of his followers. There come times when a leader finds himself alone, ignored or betrayed by his followers' other loyalties.

To know when to stand valiantly alone, and let time and circumstance justify one's stand, is essential to the leader. To be on occasion possessed of a fine serenity which rises above the rack and sweat of continual battle is necessary. But these requisites are the fruits only of a strong faith. And the leader without this may well founder in discouragement and despair.

There will be those who will say that this plea for the leader's possession of faith is purely rhetorical; that it is untenable; that it represents a nostalgia for feelings and attitudes no longer possible in the modern world.

But in those leadership situations which involve summoning people to objectives of any but the most obvious and specialized scope, the leader will gain immeasurably in stature and power if he holds a profound faith in the reality of a meaning in human destiny.

This demand for a spiritual faith has always been realized by the greatest leaders. But it is peculiarly a demand of our own time upon all leaders of high and low estate. It is a demand even in ventures where the immediate objectives may seem completely material.

THE LEADER IN A DEMOCRACY

N O NATIONAL leader in a democracy, Theodore Roosevelt is quoted as saying, could be called a statesman if he was not at the same time a politician in accomplishing his political ideas.

This statement calls attention to the truth that in a democracy every leader fundamentally faces a unique challenge. Where every man considers himself as good as the next man, the one who is to assert leadership has to *prove* his right to lead. And he has to translate aspiration into acceptable methods.

Before the democratic idea had gained its present wide acceptance, the power which got things done was thought to be the power of force. Even in nominally religious organizations and obviously in the institutions of government and property, it was seemingly true that might made right. In a society where this was the fact, leadership was naturally conceived in terms of the possession and exercise of might, of the ability to dominate. In fact, our present notions of leadership are still largely influenced by the carry-over from this earlier social situation with its emphasis on command.

We live today in a professedly democratic society where the claims and prerogatives of each individual are given implicit support. The right of every person to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness has been widely accepted—at least in theory. Men are assumed to be born, in certain important respects, free and equal. The unique worthfulness of each personality is sup-

posedly taken for granted, and a resulting attitude of approximate equalitarianism is in the ascendant.

Does not this affirmation of essential spiritual equality lessen the opportunity and need for leadership? Does not the whole modern stress upon the individual personality as the ultimate seat of all values minimize leadership possibilities?

On the contrary, the truth is that in a democratic society the opportunity for leadership multiplies enormously, *once leadership is understood in its psychologically sound essentials.*

The real danger in a democracy is the danger of mediocrity and uniformity, of popularly imposed standards of right and value. The danger is lack of guidance, of direction and of spiritual excitement. Positive effort has to be made to get people away from stagnation and compliance—in the direction of selfhood, vision and achievement.

Democracies do not make leadership easy. They may even seem to discourage the rise of leaders and to distrust those who do arise. But the opportunity which a democratic society presents to the individual who can demonstrate his right to have influence is without parallel. For a democracy, however level and compliant it may seem on the surface, is in fact a composite of individuals who are craving to realize themselves in ways they hardly sense, craving to be caught up into effort which calls out and satisfies their deepest aspirations.

Nor is the opportunity to lead confined to the area of politics, which is the field most commonly thought of when democracy is mentioned. Political leadership is important; yet it is clearly only one of many possible fields of action in which human nature has to express itself. The opportunity to lead fairly shouts aloud for

its chance in *every* organization and institution which bring the citizens of a democratic community together. For in every area of action people are seeking to fulfill themselves. They deeply want to rise above a nominal or legal equality to an assertion of their own intrinsic superiorities of capacity and achievement. But to do this they have to be led. They have to be brought into effective group relationships which are certainly not spontaneous, but the creation of those in the vanguard.

Such relationships in a complex society are the necessary condition of self-release and indeed of self-being for everyone but geniuses and prophets. The leadership predominantly required is not that of such supermen, valuable though these rare individuals are in creating new reaches of human vision and aspiration. The demand is, rather, for a multiplicity of leaders in many fields.

The positions of leadership in a democracy may be roughly compared to the role of the professional guide in mountain climbing. The guide is not thought of as better than or superior to those whom he precedes up the mountain side. He is merely regarded—and this is sufficient—as superior in his knowledge and skill in reaching the top of a particular peak. There are, of course, the occasional explorers who make the first conquests. They are, no doubt, the greater climbers; they may be compared to the seers and prophets of the world. The world needs both kinds. But the opportunity for the guide type of leader in a democracy is peculiarly great. In all group efforts he can save his followers from awkward and dangerous mistakes. And at his best he can carry them to unattained heights.

The central difficulty does not lie, as might appear, in the hesitancy of a free people to be led. It lies in the possibility that those required to and asked to lead will

take matters into their own hands and be autocrats rather than leaders.

It is sound and right that in democratic communities the burden of proof should be upon the leader. Never forget that democratic peoples have had their historic lessons and are properly fearful of dynasties, dictators, autocrats and hereditary aristocracies. What they properly ask, therefore, is that every leader—of high or low degree—shall continuously justify himself in terms of his mindfulness of the rights and aspirations of the free agents who are his followers.

This does not argue against quality and superiority of talent, taste, insight and spiritual vision in the leaders. It argues that these are peculiarly essential. The good leader will always be the aristocrat in the proper and original sense of being the best one to give the lead by virtue of his superior abilities. But it is *the manner* in which those abilities are used and *the ends* for which they are used which become the crucial factors. Indeed, it is this problem of how to translate leadership capacity into terms of truly democratic usefulness which constitutes the central theme of this volume.

Any lowering of the leader's standards and aims to the level of the led would thus be fatal. The leader should know his followers better than they know themselves and his vision of them and for them should be at once realistic and forward-looking. The leader's task—and this is as true in the shop and store as it is in the White House—is to bring people to loyalty to causes which are worthy of them as free and responsible individuals.

In a profound sense people in following the sound leader are following their own best selves. This is but another way of saying that the expansion of personality which the leader helps his followers to achieve

coincides with their central demand upon life itself.
That oneness which he achieves with them at a new level
of aspiration and action *is* the justification of leadership
in a democracy. For a democracy is nothing if it is
not a spiritual fact—a fact of fruitful personal relation
to the community. And the intermediary in helping
to bring that relation into being is the leader—or
rather a whole supporting gallery of leaders.

This is what is meant when it is reiterated that leader-
ship supplies excitement and exhilaration. At its best
it enables us all to transcend ourselves. And for that
very reason, vital to living in a democratic society,
leadership must be at work *in every common, workaday
situation where one person directs others.* It is not alone
concerned with important causes and large movements.

It is concerned to make all the day-to-day experi-
ences of group living become possessed of importance
and significance for the persons involved.

HOW TO TRAIN LEADERS

TRAINING for leadership is already an accomplished fact. It is being carried on in large corporations, in the church, in education, in social work, in character-building agencies. Indeed there is hardly a field requiring large numbers of individuals well-equipped for directive efforts which is not today seeking in various formal ways to train candidates for such posts or to make the present incumbents more effective.

On the whole, however, the objective of most of this training is to stress technical mastery and executive ⁕skill rather than capacity to influence others in a leading sense. Naturally where such training is undertaken in special organizations, the unique problems are treated as separate techniques. A boy scout leader, a factory manager, a head nurse, a chamber of commerce secretary—each must exercise leadership through a different factual and technical content.

Yet there remains a *common task in all training situations of vitalizing and harmonizing the desires and motives of the led*. And it is this essential phase of leadership training which needs emphasis since upon this phase least work has been done and there remains the greatest room for improvement.

In order to realize the objectives of leadership training, experience shows it is necessary to include at least five elements: (1) a knowledge of the general characteristics of human nature as these are set forth

in general and applied psychology; (2) self-knowledge of one's own unique combination of qualities with their varying degrees of strength and weakness; (3) a working grasp of the right attitude to possess in dealing with people; (4) an ability to apply all of this knowledge to the mobilizing of energy and enthusiasm for the special objectives of the organization; and (5) deliberate efforts at broadening of the total personality in a cultural direction.

As the first step, prior to working out these objectives in training leaders, it is necessary, however, to get organized properly.

ORGANIZING FOR TRAINING

The first concern in large-scale organizations should be to organize the administration of leadership training under a thoroughly competent director of training.[1] Programs such as those here suggested depend for their vitality upon the quality of this direction. And fortunate indeed is the organization which recognizes the value of paying enough to put its training activities under the guidance of a good educator who will command the respect and admiration of the entire group. Even if no formal post is created, someone in the top executive organization has to become *definitely responsible* for this training of leaders, whether the group is large or small.

In this connection it should be emphasized that the distinction between the teacher and the doer found in many fields holds true in the field of training for leadership. The good trainer often will not be one who is conspicuous as an executive leader. That is not required of him. Rather is he required to know what to teach and how—based on this grasp of the necessary subject

matter. The learner will thus be enabled to rise above the source of his instruction and improve upon it, just as in any art the teacher is not necessarily a virtuoso, but expects his abler pupils to advance to a degree of proficiency he will never know.

The next dictate of wisdom in training leaders concerns the careful selection of candidates for training and periodic weeding out of those not found up to standard. Organizations have until recently always tended to advance to posts of leadership those who were the best workers in specific departments. Now the first question wisely being asked is. Will the candidate develop into a good leader of men?

Any sound answer to this question assumes that the organization has been able to formulate in reasonably precise terms what the particular personal qualities are which it must have in its leaders. In other words, it will have made some sort of job analysis including the two related phases of required *duties* and required personal *talents.*

It has been found that individuals with quite different combinations of qualities may often attain equal success in some specific leadership situation.[2] This means that the personality requirements of certain posts are characterized by a good deal of latitude and do not admit of too narrow a statement of needed personal attributes.

A general intelligence test should probably be given as a next step. There is a presumption that no person of really low intelligence will be a good prospect. But the level of intelligence which will have the greatest likelihood of success in a given setting can only be determined within broad limits by an accumulation of experience. There should be full realization that the intelligence factor is only one, and that deficiency

here may be compensated for by superior development of other useful qualities such as perseverance.

Other types of test have been designed to throw light on other qualities. These include tests of emotional stability, "extroversion-introversion," "ascendancy-submission," "personality inventory," "special aptitudes" and vocational interests. No doubt each kind can offer some help to the individual in knowing his weak points and to the trainer in disclosing what training to stress. That any of them are tests of any effective combination of leadership qualities as such is not, of course, claimed, for they are not designed for that purpose.

If it could be assumed, however, that emotional stability is an asset, or that there is a slight advantage in a more extrovert temperament, or that the factors of "ascendancy" should be relatively strong—objective testing of these might well have diagnostic value. There is still room for an immense amount of research on methods of analyzing personality in general and in particular as related to leadership effectiveness.

Craig and Charters[3] have offered a check-list of questions for self-answer developed in connection with their study of personal leadership among industrial executives. This can be adapted for use in many other types of leadership positions as well, in order to give some inkling of strength and weakness of valued qualities. There are a number of other experimental attempts to supply rating scales for qualities of leadership, but none of them can be said to be beyond the stage of experiment.

It is in the actual experience of leadership activities that the strength and weakness of needed traits are best disclosed. If the apprentice leader is getting proper supervision in his early efforts to lead this is one of the

best possible ways to get an evaluation of his effective-
ness. Just as in sports the coach is expected to help the
player to self-knowledge and improvement by watching
him in action, so the training director should be able to
supply a similar service by close and friendly advice.

Indeed, leadership training definitely requires that
wise personal counsel be constantly available. And
one potentially important instrument in the hands of
such counselors is every available test which can help
to identify capacities and shortcomings.

TRAINING IN PSYCHOLOGY

The usual textbook in general psychology has proved
not too helpful to the adult student anxious to learn
about human nature. Somehow the whole person in
action in typical situations seems to get lost to view in
these volumes, and what remains for study are certain
specific traits, behavior patterns, modes of response
and descriptions of partial processes like "learning"
and "reasoning."

This difficulty has prompted the writing of numerous
books using psychological material and relating it to
actual human situations in which behavior as a whole,
with all its attendant influences, can be analyzed.
It is this type of volume which has proved to supply
the more satisfactory content for an introduction to
the subject for the adult learner. Later the more
systematic analysis offered in the formal psychological
texts can be studied with profit, especially if this can
be done with a teacher who vitalizes the subject by the
use of illustrations and cases.

Of course one cannot learn from a book to know
human nature in the vivid sense required for tactful
and adept human dealings. There are always those to
be found in training whose book knowledge is as excel-

lent as their personal contacts are inept. And, contrari-
wise, there are plenty of leaders highly skilled in human
dealings who never opened a text on psychology.

But we have at our disposal today as never before a
body of organized and tested data about people's normal
(and abnormal) motives and responses which can and
should be brought to the attention of the inexperienced
or the unskillful. They can then carry on their work
with some knowledge of methods of human dealing,
and thus be able to avoid bungling trial-and-error
methods. All that has been said, for example, in the
chapter on methods and manners of leading is really an
effort to state general psychological truths in applied
terms.

For this is what psychology at its best is trying to do.
It formulates, clarifies and reduces to precise statement
our knowledge of the ways in which people behave under
different circumstances. It is concerned with the what,
the how and the why of human conduct. To ignore this
growing body of knowledge or not to accept whatever
light it may shed upon human nature, would be like
trying to work in metallurgy with no knowledge of
chemistry.

A study of as much psychology as possible is more
essential to the leader today than ever before because
the practical lessons to be learned are increasingly clear
and definite.[4]

As an illustration consider the value of a con-
stant appreciation of what has come to be called "the
psychology of the evolving situation." This phrase
stands for a familiar, common-sense fact which is,
nevertheless, all too often ignored by leaders. It sug-
gests that as events in a group move forward, each new
happening may well change the entire complexion of
the problem. We have to view the affairs in which we

participate as *going, yet changing, wholes*, into which new influences are constantly entering to alter the realities to be dealt with.

It is bromidic to say that the world does not stand still. But it is difficult to get leaders to realize in their human dealings that they are constantly facing new problems or at least new emphases and proportions in the problem. Especially where a leader is not in continuously close touch with the reactions of his followers this is an ever-present danger. *The leader is always dealing with evolving facts and forces*, even though he may feel that he is dealing with static conditions. If he works with the facts of yesterday upon the issues of today, he is by that much removed from realities and is dealing with facts which exist only in his mind.

A simple anecdote will suggest how prevalent and important are the conditions to which this truth applies. It will serve to remind the leader that he must at all times keep himself up-to-date with the repercussions of events upon his followers. Professor E. D. Smith[5] recounts the following incident:

A company for years had worked to reduce the amount of unemployment among its employees. Among other measures, when work was slack in one department the surplus employees were, as far as possible, transferred to some other department where work was available. The transferred employees were paid their full regular wage or average piecework earnings. In the fall, in a department where eight or nine months were required to train operatives, a crew of about twenty girls had been hired to undergo training for an expected spring rush. At the end of the year, when these girls were only partly trained, a shortage of work occurred. The management decided that in giving out what little regular work there was in the department, preference should be given to the group of apprentices so that their training would not be interrupted. Consequently, as work grew less, it became necessary to transfer long-service employees while

the apprentices remained on their own jobs. Unfortunately, the first girl to be transferred was one who had had twenty-five years of service. Unfortunat&ly also, when she was told of the temporary transfer no explanation was made of why the junior girls were not transferred first.

The woman went to the department of transfer without complaint. On her arrival, one of the older women there exclaimed: "You transferred, Sadie? With your twenty-five years of service? They must be very flat in Department J." The transferred employee said that there was work enough for all the younger girls, none of whom had been transferred. On finding a sympathetic listener, she began to feel that she had been wronged. During the lunch hour she told the story to one of the older girls in her own department and met the same response. Soon the story was going the rounds of the department, striking up an unfailing sense of sympathy and outrage among the long-service people there. All of them felt a sense of injury to themselves. The imagined wrong to one "old-timer" became the symbol of injustice to all long-service employees. Her rights symbolized the rights of the group.

Soon these employees were speaking of the incident in such phrases as: "Doesn't service count for anything here?" "So twenty-five years of devotion is to be a reason for being thrown out first!" "Think how this will affect the reputation of the company in the town!" Because all the older workers who made up the group had the same point of view, the overwrought statement of the situation did not come in contact with denial. No one stopped to look into the situation and see if it had some valid reason. No one brought to mind the fact that the woman was transferred at full pay instead of being laid off without any pay at all. Any person who had such thoughts was left out of the excited circle.

The next day the situation in the department was tense. The incident which had aroused the crowd spirit stimulated, besides the desire that this twenty-five-year-service employee be returned to her regular work, the broader desires of the long-service employees for respect, and consideration from the management. As so often happens, the stimulation of a particular desire resulted in stimulation of deep fundamental urges. Consequently, the group had become freshly sensitive

concerning the entire conduct of the management in regard
to them. Trivial incidents were magnified into serious and
deliberate abuse of the rights of the older employees. Every
little imperfection in the way the work came to the girls,
the slightest delay at the dispatch board in giving out jobs
to long-service employees, every minor difficulty of what-
ever kind, caused disproportionate irritation. Moreover, the
foreman, who was a young man with short service with the
company, was denounced as "indifferent," "inconsiderate,"
"uppish." Nothing he did was right. . . .

Finally, the situation became so extreme that intervention
by the higher management was necessary . . . The man-
ager called in four or five of the most influential women in
the group. With considerable difficulty he finally traced his
way back through the maze of trivial complaints which these
women made until they told him the incident from which
the disturbance had originated. With difficulty, also, the
attention of the employees was held on the facts of the case
and prevented from relapsing upon their general sense of
wrong long enough for them to be brought to understand the
reasons for the action taken.

When the true reasons were understood, when the manage-
ment confessed its error in not explaining the situation in
advance to the long-service people who were transferred,
and when they made clear the company's policy of consider-
ation for long-service employees, the common fear which
underlay this outburst of feeling was dispelled. The transfer
of the long-service worker was no longer looked on as sym-
bolic, but as an individual incident. As such, the incident
was readily accepted as merely an oversight. The storm
thus blew over as rapidly as it had gathered.

It was long, however, before the antipathy to the young
foreman entirely died out. The habits and feelings built up
in times of crowd excitement often long survive the crowd
spirit from which they spring. After the incident is appar-
ently over, the suspicions, dislikes and undesirable habits
to which it gave rise live on to disturb peaceful industrial
relations.   •

Here was a graphic instance of the subtle and rapid
working of psychological forces affecting the relation

of individuals to the group as a whole and to the executive leaders. And the only way the leaders could wisely cope with the disruption of normal relations was *to be sure at every moment that they knew what new influences were at work and why.* The danger was always that they would be in the dark about current reactions of the workers.

Several related truths are also suggested by this anecdote. One is that when maladjustments occur there can never be a complete return to the states of mind which everyone had before the incident occurred. The leader is forced to deal with a slightly altered total situation. New factors have entered and new influences have come to have an effect. New incipient threats to morale are present to which the leader must be continually alive.

Again, the leader should understand that even though the situation is moving in directions more favorable to morale, as a result of his direction, there is always a lag in the followers' response. The leader may have been instrumental in a broadening of objectives so that his followers will go along with him more whole-heartedly. But he may be disappointed at the slowness with which they respond. Where the followers have been habitually on their guard against narrower and more selfish group objective (as, for example, in business corporations), they naturally look at first with suspicion on new efforts of the leader to win their support— a support which previously they could not safely give.

Indeed one shrewd industrialist has observed that in many corporate groups it may well take a generation for the mental habits of fear and suspicion of the personnel to be altered to one of trust and cooperation, even though the character of the leadership has radically changed in a liberal direction.

Another truth to which the story related above points is that in the relation of the leader to his group it is not necessarily what the leader thinks he is trying to do, *but what the led think, however erroneously*, that is the determining factor. Again and again we find instances of the wrong thinking among the followers due to a variety of causes. And only as the leader knows what is really on the followers' minds is he dealing realistically with his problem. To be able to get behind the scenes in the thinking and feeling of the entire group is a vital necessity.

This example of applied study of a psychological problem is merely illustrative of the kind of values to be extracted from resourceful analysis. It should be obvious that such study imaginatively pursued is indispensable in the potential leader's curriculum of training.

TRAINING IN SELF-KNOWLEDGE

Not the least of the values derived from systematic psychological study is the stimulus it gives to a more careful scrutiny of one's own personal attributes. And this scrutiny is specially important for the leader in training.

This does not mean an encouragement of morbid introspectiveness or continuous soul-searching. But occasionally the leader should try to appraise his own strong and weak points. He should try to study how to remove any discovered deficiencies. Beyond a limited point this kind of self-appraisement cannot be undertaken alone, both because it is hard for us to be quite honest with ourselves, and because the impression we make upon others is a crucial factor in our success, and the truth about that impression is impossible for each of us to discover by himself.

The leader stands always in need of the constructively candid friend. And it is not alone a question of telling a man what is wrong with him, but of being able to suggest the steps to take to correct it. To be able to offer such correction sympathetically and educationally is a priceless gift.

TRAINING IN ATTITUDES

The leader, as we have seen, gains a large part of his effectiveness by having the right quality of personal attitude toward other people. Admittedly this is not quickly taught nor quickly changed. Perhaps the first step is for the one in training to get a clear mental picture from observation of good examples of what a friendly attitude means. The next step may be to get an awareness of what such an attitude implies both in friendliness and in manners, as already analyzed in earlier chapters. Experience shows that many leaders are unaware, first, of the importance of the attitude they unconsciously assume, and second, do not know what kind of manners, tone of voice, bearing and phrasings on their own part are most persuasive in giving effect to a right attitude.

A kindly disposition and some evidence of interest in the other fellow's point of view together with consideration of his feelings and reactions—these are not built into behavior in a moment. They are a growth resulting only from actual experience with the meliorating influence of a right outlook. This again argues for placing the prospective leader as soon as possible in an actual leadership situation, where his conduct can be studied and where the trainer can point out specifically when and why the wrong line is taken.

Moreover, a right attitude toward people will be developed if the individual has a total life attitude

pervaded by that spiritual faith already characterized. Respect for the personality of others, a strong sense of the dignity and intrinsic worth of each person, realization that all men are similar and on an equal footing in more ways than they are different—all this is essentially a religious and a democratic outlook in the best and deepest sense. It introduces a qualitative basis into human dealings and enhances the values of good human relations by taking account of the true community of interests among men. An underlying sense of this is invaluable for the leader.

This sense is not imparted by exhortation but much can come from the contagion of example and of suggestion. This whole attitude commends itself as good when the wholesomeness and fineness of the response it calls out from others can be watched by the leader in training. And once he has experienced that regard toward himself and toward others which a right attitude brings, he will gradually be influenced to adopt it and cherish it.

In short, unless the training project consciously takes account of this objective of a right attitude and of every possible way of showing those in training how to give it expression, the whole process will be deficient at a crucial point.

TRAINING TO HELP MAKE GROUP OBJECTIVES ATTRACTIVE

Technical mastery or even earnest devotion to the objective on the leader's part does not automatically give rise to the followers' support. There is the further duty upon the leader to clarify, to vitalize and to maintain support for the aims being pursued.

This argues, first, for definite instruction of the prospective leaders in the nature of the group's purpose,

the reasons why the group is striving for it, the background of its efforts, the broad lines of method employed. The new leader should be steeped in knowledge of what the group is trying to do. Otherwise his zeal is like a house built upon the sand; it has no firm foundation.

Especially where the followers' relations to the group are typically one of contract and they are hired into it as they are in all employer-employee relationships, a second responsibility arises. This is the responsibility of making the objective as attractive as possible. This is not a task of hypnosis, of superimposed aims, of trick appeals. It is a matter of determining how far the group aims can be shown to bring realization and satisfaction to the followers, and of making this clear to them through convincing experiences.

The training of leaders should therefore include a study of the present objectives to see how appealing they really are and how that appeal can be interpreted. Always it must be remembered that this task is twofold. People must be told and retold why they are benefited by loyalty to the group. And they must simultaneously find this truth out for themselves and have it confirmed in their experience within the group.

In this connection, too, the value of *ability to speak well in public* should be strongly emphasized. In many group situations the leader can greatly increase his effectiveness in popularizing objectives as well as other ideas by being a persuasive public speaker. This ability can demonstrably be improved by good instruction. And it is a skill which might well be used far more and to splendid advantage by leaders in action. Many an otherwise competent leader materially lessens his effectiveness by his halting and fumbling manner of public utterance whereas many another has been able to make

up for certain deficiencies by his power of platform performance. Persuasiveness in exhortation is not, of course, to be employed to the exclusion of other essential qualities. Used alone it readily becomes exploitative or merely temporarily exciting. But used in conjunction with defensible aims, it is an invaluable adjunct of the effort to exercise influence.

Training in speaking may be carried on in groups under competent direction, or a good start can be made by careful personal study of the best available books on the subject.[6] Here, too, constant practice is essential; and the more such practice can be criticized by a friendly observer, the more rapidly can improvement be made. One anxious to improve his speaking ability should accept every legitimate chance to get on his feet in public and secure practice. There is just one cautionary word which should be added: Only speak when you know *you really have something to say*. At least half of the battle in public address is to have a message which is burning to be uttered.

TRAINING IN PERSONALITY CULTIVATION

The one who is most richly a *person* will, other things being equal, make the best leader. And this indefinable condition of being a person seems to depend upon an awareness of and responsiveness to life's realities in many directions. The best leader brings all aspects of a wide experience to bear upon his main drive. He is alive on many fronts and has diverse interests which serve to enrich his major one.

Can this kind of total quality of personableness be deliberately achieved through training?

To a limited extent the answer to this question is— yes. The objective of personality cultivation—subject

though it has been to charlatanism—is more and more attaining a real status as the possible content of training to realize it is understood.

That content, as it has thus far been organized, exists on two distinct levels, the less profound of which has to do with organizing the more habitual ways and means of carrying on the individual's personal life. There is an increasing library of volumes which offer useful suggestions to those who feel a need for this kind of guidance.[7] Individual and group study of such volumes has proved in many cases an effective introduction to an awareness of methods of more effective personal living.

Admittedly the scope of such study is limited. But it can under wise guidance be made the means of leading a group which has had limited educational advantages to a better sense of how to organize their capacities and to reach out for cultural influences of which they may formerly have been ignorant.

Undoubtedly a capacity to appreciate and be refreshed by a contact with the best that has been thought and artistically created in the world, is one of the vital requirements in the enlargement of personality. This enrichment of one's intellectual and emotional background and perception quickens the whole individual. Certainly one readily available means to this end is wide reading, especially if it is stimulated and guided in association with educators whose cultural resources are great and whose outlook is robust and contemporary.

One should come to understand something of the major achievements in the great fields of human thought. A general picture of the natural sciences, the social sciences, philosophy, political history, biology and the fine arts should gradually be attained. The best novels of the great world literatures and the best biography

will prove to be immensely revealing as to the accumu-
lated wisdom of mankind.

Indeed, in every special field of leadership training, a
careful selection of the biographies and autobiographies
of the outstanding leaders in that field should prove an
excellent stimulus. Such reading might well introduce
the prospective leader to the absorbing possibilities and
values of books in a way that more general volumes
would not.

Obviously this is not a task to be finished in a few
months. It is literally a life-long project, the reaches of
which broaden as one's range of interests widens with
the years. But it is a project which, if held definitely
in view and carried along avocationally as a delightful
supplement to one's more closely vocational develop-
ment, can be infinitely rewarding and satisfying.

It should not be made a chore. Such reading may be
planned in a general way from year to year, but momen-
tary selection from some broad master reading list may
well be left to the inclinations of the hour.

There are increasing numbers of "outline" books in
the major fields of human knowledge which are not
hard reading and which can help to impart a comprehen-
sive view, leaving the reader to exercise his own taste
in further and more specialized selections.

Such programs of adult cultural development may
tempt the individual to a superficial smattering. But
so increasingly interrelated have become all the special
fields of human knowledge that it should be possible,
given a clear major vocational field of study, to make
reading in every other field throw some light and
perspective upon one's central interest.

TRAINING METHODS

Having characterized the broad intent as well as
the content of leadership training, we shall now examine

the various methods of giving it expression. A number of these deserve consideration, since some adaptation of one or another or of several in combination can be made for most possible uses.

The following methods of instruction are available:

1. Experience in a leadership situation under some supervision.

2. Progression from small to larger leadership situations.

3. Apprentice courses of practice and study.

4. Conference study of methods by groups of leaders.

5. Systematic personal conferences of trainer and leader.[8]

EXPERIENCE IN A LEADERSHIP SITUATION UNDER SOME SUPERVISION

When a superintendent, foreman or department head is out sick or leaves on a vacation or business trip, and the assistant executive assumes charge of the work, there is an excellent chance for leadership training. A new teacher substituting for another, a young ministerial applicant out "candidating," a local political aspirant making his maiden speech—these present the same opportunity. A vice-chairman or vice-president who is occupying the head official's post in his absence is in a similar position. Countless situations arise where the sub-leader has a temporary chance to be the full leader. So valuable can this kind of opportunity be that it would be useful in many organizations if it were more deliberately created as a matter of training policy. Executives could profitably be accorded longer holidays, or be sent away on tours of inspection and study, or be temporarily assigned to special staff functions—in order that genuine leadership experiences might be made available to assistants whom the organization intends

to promote to full responsibility when the opening comes.

"How well does it go when I'm away?" is a question the answer to which can throw much light on the success most executives are having in developing the leadership talents of their assistants.

For the substitution to bear fruit educationally the behavior of the one temporarily in command *should be subject to constant scrutiny and friendly criticism of a constructive kind.* In large corporations this is done by a staff executive of personnel, either a personnel manager himself or a training director working with him. And an official with similar function will increasingly have to be available in many other large groups—governmental, institutional, educational, etc. For corrective supervision is absolutely essential in order to avoid the serious danger of a vast amount of copying of tricks of leadership manner and method which represent no advance and reveal no awareness of better procedures.

A valid truth in this connection is that stated by Aristotle ages ago when he said that a man becomes a good flute-player by playing the flute, but he also becomes a bad flute-player by playing the flute. Experience, in short, has to be guided or interpreted to be most fruitful.

A similar service of friendly counsel should be available to the executive who is suddenly advanced into a permanent position of leadership. Such individuals often have misgivings about their capacity as well as no complete knowledge of the details of the new task. This whole problem of the induction of promoted executives so that they may as quickly as possible function effectively, deserves far more attention in practically every organization. And its relation to the development of leadership capacity is close.

There are usually opportunities for the first assistant leader to get practice in leadership as a regular part of his job. Often he comes into more continuous personal touch with the group than the one above him. In such cases his method of dealing may crucially set the tone of the relation of group members to the whole organization. Where this is true an educational experience is in process which can count for such, especially if the assistant can have the benefit of experienced oversight. Such review may take place in training conferences with other assistants or in personal conferences with his own chief or with a personnel training director (both of which procedures are described below).

PROGRESSION FROM SMALLER TO LARGER LEADERSHIP SITUATIONS

Progressive advancement from lesser to greater posts of leadership may be either part of a deliberate developmental program or just the routine way in which by trial and error the potentially better leader is discovered. In a factory a promising worker is made head of a gang or a room or some other part of a whole department, from which he becomes assistant foreman and then foreman; then possibly a division foreman, assistant superintendent and superintendent. In a department store a competent sales person may rise to be assistant buyer, then buyer, and so on. In politics a man may qualify as alderman, state representative and state senator, and then go on into the congressional field.

More often than not, progression of this sort is not formalized or supervised closely. If the individual is able to make the most of his position, is reasonably popular with those he leads, finds favor with those in a position to advance him and has patience to stay on with the organization—the chances of advancement are good.

Yet the likelihood of developing really good leadership qualities in this way is not great. The educational process of raw experience, while unquestionably valuable, does not readily rise above its sources. It results usually in too much imitation of those who have the prestige of present leadership; and neither the attitude nor the technique of the new leader profits by fresh or constructive criticism.

This widely met process of rising from one area of effort to another is, then, most valuable educationally where it is watched over, evaluated and criticized by an older and more expert leader or trainer of leaders. In politics the political boss behind the scenes often exercises just this function for the younger party aspirants. In industry the personnel executive may be such a guide. In education it may be a city superintendent of schools or college president. But all too frequently the role of mentor is explicitly assumed by no one, and the learning experience is the uneconomical one of unguided personal trial and error.

By all means recognize the possibility of advancement for leaders, and provide them as they grow and rise with some critical and constructive commentary on their labors.

APPRENTICE COURSES OF PRACTICE AND STUDY

The process of leadership advancement just described may, however, be organized into a planned apprentice procedure. In a few large stores, banks, insurance companies and industrial organizations this method has been used in a highly suggestive way. It usually entails a combination of formal study of the organization's history and objectives with a sampling of actual practice work for a few weeks or months in several typical departments. At the end of that period there follows

placement in a small executive post where work can be carefully observed for another six months period.

After that if the candidate does well he is advanced to a still more responsible job, after which his progress as executive depends upon his own capacities and the openings in the administrative staff. Sometimes along with this goes the preparation of an intensive written study of some staff problem which can be highly informative to the apprentice and, if he is really able, be useful as staff research.

This general procedure is capable of many adaptations. But it implies careful supervision and continuous personal conferences with the apprentices by the executive to whom they are responsible. The best results will be obtained only when the objectives of technical mastery and organization fitness are kept in proper balance with that of training in the best ways of becoming a genuine leader.

The difficulties which have been found with this method deserve brief mention. There must be careful initial selection of apprentices; there must be real chances, not too long deferred, for promotion to posts of responsibility; the candidates must be prevented from getting swelled heads; there must be no artificial effort to hold those trained in the organization if they have outgrown the opportunities it can offer; there must be great care exercised that the rest of the organization does not come to feel that these apprentices are special favorites of the management rather than potential leaders who are advancing in their own right.

CONFERENCE STUDY OF METHODS BY GROUPS OF LEADERS

The use of conferences organized for the discussion of methods of human dealing among executive leaders

similarly placed, has been growing rapidly in recent years. Industry has its foremen's councils; stores have meetings of department heads; there are "institutes" of secretaries and directors of business and trade associations, of adult-education leaders, of secretaries of character-building associations.

In more and more fields there is coming recognition of the indispensable value of some form of periodic or sabbatical refreshment and study. No area of leadership is today exempt from rapid advances in knowledge and technique; and one way to assure that such knowledge gets applied is to provide organized plans of "post-entry training" or "refresher courses" or "in-service training"—all of which phrases are in current use in governmental services and other employments.

If the objective of training for improved leadership is—as it usually should be—included when advanced technical training is given, there is some experience which suggests how it can be realized.

It is often possible, for example, to draw upon the group in advance, if they are past the early stages of apprenticeship, for descriptions of situations or cases which can usefully be discussed. These may be unsolved problems, solved problems where the leader feels that the solution might well have been different, topics like "the use of commendation" which can often be illuminated by actual instances. Sometimes a canvass among the followers will disclose certain frequently met criticisms of supervisors which can be brought for discussion to a leaders' conference. This method was developed several years ago in an interesting way and with valuable results by the Western Electric Company.[9]

A further excellent variant on this idea, where those who are to participate in the conferences have a good

background of leadership experience, is to have three or four of the members prepare their own course in advance—by selecting topics, getting cases and problems and assigning special projects for study or recording. Unquestionably this method with a little supervision can stimulate great interest, develop subject-matter with a practical content and provide a learning experience of special richness.

Also, a valuable by-product of such conferences is the discovery of leadership talent. Certain members of such groups frequently come to stand out and be recognized as they would not have been otherwise. And in cases where the chairmanship is rotated a further disclosure of certain leadership capacities is almost sure to take place.

SYSTEMATIC PERSONAL CONFERENCES OF TRAINER AND LEADER

Naturally where leadership training is going forward under enlightened direction, there will be all sorts of reasons and occasions for intimate face-to-face conferences of trainer and leader-in-training. These to be most valuable should be carefully planned by the trainer. Their content and point should be clearly considered by him in advance. Too much ground cannot be covered at one sitting. The trainer must be closely in touch with the actual conduct on the job of the one being trained and secure the impressions of other executives and working associates to help guide his corrective efforts.

Sometimes these personal interviews are planned to review actual conduct, sometimes to go over specified readings, sometimes to take up studies made and papers written. Several personnel executives in large

organizations make it part of their work to have informal chats with their department heads and foremen every three months, using as the occasion for the conference the desire to collect instances of difficulties in handling people, disciplinary cases and examples of poor training—all of which throw light not only upon the operating success of the general personnel policy but also upon the several department heads' reactions and methods as leaders.

It is further true that the higher in the executive hierarchy one goes, the more ideally desirable does it become that any commentary on an individual's leadership limitations in action should become a matter of private conversation and not of group review. One of the greatest dangers as organizations increase in size is that there will be no one able to or willing to offer constructive criticism of the top leadership of the organization.

This is one of the unsolved problems of leadership. How shall the very top leaders in all kinds of groups get the constructively critical comment and check they should have?

Where the leader is selected by the group and dependent upon its good will for retaining his position, as in political office, there are the evaluation and review which come at times of election. But where, as in many other types of group, the top leader is responsible to a board of trustees or board of directors, it is far less easy to be sure that he is not dominating his own governing board in such ways as to lessen the likelihood that any necessary criticism of him will be made.

A few general words may therefore be useful regarding any possible methods of measuring the results of leadership training—which involves of course measuring leadership itself.

MEASURING THE RESULTS OF TRAINING

Any training reflects its success in the ability of the person to make effective use of what he has learned. He should *feel, think and act* differently and appropriately as the result of training.

For the leader this means a new effectiveness in human dealings. It means that he achieves a finer attitude toward and a deeper regard for his followers. He has a new deftness of manners, bearing and persuasiveness.

Are there any ways of measuring these factors? Admittedly this is not an easy matter, for it is hard to discover measurable units that can be accurately and objectively appraised. The following hints may, however, have some value as suggesting possible applications to certain types of leadership situation[10] which it may be possible to measure or appraise—as indirect reflections of the results of leadership:

1. The volume of work done by the group of which he is leader. It may be possible to measure this in terms of volume or cost per unit of man hours.

2. The quality of work done by the group. Sometimes this can be done by inspection, sometimes by studies of attitudes of clients, customers or the public.

3. The stability of membership in the group. If there is a marked tendency for people to enter the group and then quickly resign, that is a bad sign. Figures of "labor turnover" are used in many organizations to discover such a tendency.[11] And figures of the number of individuals who have stayed with the group for a given number of years can further show how stable the group is.

4. The number of complaints or grievances that is brought to the responsible directors of the group.

5. The opinion of the members of the group as to their own state of mind in relation to dealings with the

leaders. Techniques for canvassing employee sentiment in this matter have been developed and used with some success by a few industrial corporations and by Mr. J. D. Houser in connection with his consulting practice.

A little ingenuity in studying specific leadership situations would no doubt enable one to devise further, measures. There might be instances where such additional items as the following would correlate closely with the presence of good leadership: number of suggestions received; severity of accidents; amount of absence; economy in operating expenditure.

By whatever method possible, it is certainly valuable to consider ways and means for the measurement of leadership success and therefore of the success of specific training methods.

CONCLUSION

Training for leadership is a genuine possibility and has been proved a positive benefit. It can be furthered by the individual leader through personal study. It can be greatly strengthened by the support of an organized program under inspiring and pedagogically competent direction.

Success in performance is the ultimate criterion of success in training. And that success, as repeatedly shown, depends not merely on what the leader gets done but on *how* he gets it done in terms of satisfactions, sustained enthusiasms and loyalties among the followers.

The world has come a long way in its effort to understand why and how the leader is more useful than the commander, and in its attempts to apply that knowledge in numerous fields.

We look out upon an immediate future, however, in which a highly concentrated and dictatorial type of

so-called leadership threatens us—not merely politically but in the influence of political practice upon all other areas of action. The danger that there will arise blind leaders of the blind is always present. The danger is ever with us that those who can take power will too easily succeed also in their powers of persuasion.

This threat to true democratic leadership has to be guarded against. Certainly one of the ways in which it is to be countered is by an assiduous spreading of psychologically sounder and socially more defensible ideas about the real inwardness of the leading process, as it has been outlined in the preceding pages.

At this crucial point good leading depends upon good followers. It depends upon people gradually being able to know wherein lies their own highest good, and upon their being moved to follow it. The process is eternally interdependent. The leader points the way but equally the followers decide that the way is good. The way will prove good in the long look only where the fine things of the intellect and the spirit are being actualized in personal living.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTERS

CHAPTER IV

[1] LUDWIG, EMIL, "Napoleon," p. 551.

[2] For details of method see Raymond C. Mayer, "How to Do Publicity." And for a splendidly organized and comprehensive bibliography on the broader phases of influencing opinion see II. L. Childs, "A Reference Guide to the Study of Public Opinion."

CHAPTER V

[1] Acknowledgment is here made to Ralph C. Davis, portions of whose unpublished work, "The Philosophy of Business Organization and Operation," I have been privileged to read.

[2] TARBELL, IDA M., "Owen D. Young, A New Type of Industrial Leader," p. 125.

[3] VAN KLEEK, MARY, "Miners and Management," p. 243.

[4] VAN KLEEK, op. cit., p. 173.

[5] VITELES, M. S., "The Science of Work," pp. 306-398.

CHAPTER VI

[1] P. A. Sorokin, in "Leaders of Labor and Radical Movements in the United States and Foreign Countries," in *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 33 (1927) pp. 382-411, says: "The majority of the American and foreign (labor) leaders come from families in the professional, business and managerial occupations. These classes have produced a share of the leaders far above their percentage in the population, and several times greater than the quota of leaders produced by semi-skilled or unskilled labor."

F. W. Taussig, and C. S. Joslyn in "American Business Leaders," reach the conclusion that business leaders tend to come, irrespective of any forces of nepotism, largely from the sons of successful business men.

[2] SYMONDS, P. M., "Diagnosing Personality and Conduct," p. 507.

[3] PEARSON, HESKETH, "The Smith of Smiths," p. 216.

CHAPTER VII

[1] WICKENDEN, W. E., and E. D. SMITH, "Engineers, Managers and Engineering Education," in *Journal of Engineering Education*, June, 1932.

[2] This subject is more fully treated in its organizational phases in Tead and Metcalf's "Personnel Administration," Chap. XXV.

[3] "Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens," p. 739.

[4] See, for example, L. F. Deland, "Imagination in Business"; Ray Giles, "Turn Your Imagination Into Money!"; Graham Wallas, "The Art of Thought."

[5] WEBB, E. T., and J. J. B. MORGAN, "Strategy in Handling People," pp. 118-119.

[6] LUDWIG, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

[7] HENDRICK, BURTON J., "The Life of Andrew Carnegie," Vol. 1, p. 371.

CHAPTER VIII

[1] BEASLEY, NORMAN, "Men Working: A Story of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company," pp. 144–145.

[2] TARBELL, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

[3] LA DAME, MARY, "The Filene Store," pp. 257–260.

CHAPTER IX

[1] These principles are, of course, readily applicable to all sorts of organizations although they had their initial applications in industry. An excellent volume to study in this connection is "Scientific Management in American Industry," by the Taylor Society.

[2] TARBELL, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

[3] HENDRICK, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 389.

[4] "The Minor Executive and Mental Hygiene," Chap. VII, in "Preventive Management;" edited by H. B. Elkind.

[5] See on this subject M. S. Viteles, "Industrial Psychology," pp. 206–212; my own "Human Nature and Management," pp. 217–221; and P. Symonds, "Diagnosing Personality and Conduct," Chap. IV.

[6] NIEBUHR, R., "In Place of Profit."

[7] On this and a number of other points in this chapter the reader is referred for more extended discussion to D. R. Craig, and W. W. Charters, "Personal Leadership in Industry."

[8] Reprint of address, "Employers' Responsibility for Industrial Peace."

[9] More fully discussed in Chap. XVIII, "The New Discipline," in my "Human Nature and Management."

CHAPTER X

[1] TARBELL, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

[2] SHEFFIELD, A. D., "Things Learned about Thinking by Thinkers in Groups" (pamphlet).

[3] HADER, J. J., and E. C. LINDEMAN, "Dynamic Social Research," p. 80.

[4] PARKES, J. W., "International Conferences," p. 152.

[5] TARBELL, *op. cit.*

[6] WALSER, FRANK, "The Art of Conference," p. 25. This whole book will repay study in this connection and it contains an excellent bibliography.

CHAPTER XI

[1] REAM, M. J., "A Tip on Managing People" in *American Management Review*, Vol. 13.

CHAPTER XIII

[1] A thoughtful volume which can be recommended as supplementary reading in connection with this important subject is M. E. Harding, "The Way of All Women."

[1] Interesting amplification of several of these ideas is to be found in W. W. Charters, "The Discovery of Executive Talent," in "Handbook of Business Administration," edited by W. J. Donald, pp. 1604–1613.

[2] See, for example, the study of two chain store managers in "Business Leadership," edited by H. C. Metcalf, pp. 247–249.

[3] See Craig and Charters, *op. cit.*, p. 235. See also a similar effort in J. D. Houser, "What the Employer Thinks," pp. 191–195. Also "Educational Leadership," Eleventh Yearbook, National Education Association, Chap. XIV.

[4] The growing library of books in this field includes, for example, Smith, E. D., "Psychology for Executives"; Viteles, M. S., "Industrial Psychology" and "The Science of Work"; my own "Human Nature and Management." Each of these volumes contains extended bibliographies of related studies.

[5] SMITH, E. D., "Psychology for Executives," pp. 187–190.

[6] See, for example, W. G. Hoffman, "Public Speaking for Business Men"; C. W. Mears, "Public Speaking for Executives"; D. Carnegie, "Public Speaking and Influencing Men in Business."

[7] See such volumes as D. A. Laird, "Increasing Personal Efficiency"; S. M. Shellow, "How to Develop Your Personality"; M. B. Greenbie, "Personality"; Arnold Bennett, "How to Live on Twenty Four Hours a Day"; H. A. Overstreet, "About Ourselves."

[8] Further evidence along similar lines is given in W. W. Charters, "The Development of Executive Talent," in "Handbook of Business Administration," pp. 1614–1633. See also for application in relation to institutional situations where objectives of character-building are to the fore, H. M. Busch, "Leadership in Group Work"; and E. D. Partridge, "Leadership among Adolescent Boys."

[9] See pamphlet, "Research Studies in Employee Effectiveness and Industrial Relations," Western Electric Company, Chicago.

[10] I am indebted to D. R. Craig for certain suggestions here as set forth in his article, "Measuring Morale and Leadership Ability," *Personnel Journal*, October, 1927.

[11] Ways and means of measuring this are set forth in O. Tead, and H. C. Metcalf, "Personnel Administration: Its Principles and Practice," Chap. XIX.

INDEX